

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1833 01872 7427

GC
974.202
C74SP



THE CHURCH SCHOOL IN OUR TIME



A SYMPOSIUM HELD OCTOBER 13-14, 1956

AT CONCORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN CELEBRATION OF

THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY

OF

ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL

COPYRIGHT, 1957
ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL
CONCORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE

PRINTED AT
THE ANDOVER PRESS, LTD.
ANDOVER, MASSACHUSETTS
U. S. A.

P R E F A C E

THIS booklet contains the proceedings of the One Hundredth Anniversary Symposium held at St. Paul's School October 13-14, 1956. Aside from some minor editing and the summary of certain discussions held during the Symposium it is substantially reproduced verbatim.

The object of the School — and its seventeen masters as a committee for the School, to plan this occasion — seems to have been remarkably well realized. We had hoped for a critical appraisal of our situation as a Church School operating in the mid-Twentieth Century. Appreciating the blessings of a hundred years, and mindful of what our history had to say, we set out to evaluate our contemporary situation, believing that we might thereby shed some light on the task ahead.

The occasion was enriched by the presence of representatives of many sister institutions, by the efforts of our speakers, and certainly not least by the presence of our Fifth and Sixth Form boys — who, not only by their presence but by their voices, gave the Symposium an added sense of reality and contemporaneity.

That St. Paul's School has been greatly benefited by all that transpired we at the School gladly affirm. Our hope is that our guests, and those who read this booklet, may also find new courage for the extraordinary opportunity which is ours in these days as we undertake to educate our young people for their duties and responsibilities in the immediate future.

St. Paul's School is grateful to those who came to share in the One Hundredth Year's celebration. We are also mindful of those who in the past labored to bring about our present strength, and are prayerful that we will be found faithful, when another generation looks backward to us for the inspiration needed for that day and duty.

MATTHEW M. WARREN, *Rector*

Concord, N. H.
January 4, 1957

AT ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL, on Saturday morning, October 13th, 1956, began the academic symposium on "The Church School in Our Time," held in celebration of the School's one hundredth year. Some two hundred guests arrived and registered; and at the house of the Vice Rector, Mr. Francis V. Lloyd, Jr., the leaders and secretaries of the eight seminars scheduled for the afternoon met to make final plans for the conducting and recording of their several discussions. The air was crisp, bright, and still — a day of unsurpassed autumnal beauty.

At 11:15, members of the School and guests assembled in Memorial Hall, and the Rector, the Reverend Matthew M. Warren, addressed them as follows:

"Today and tomorrow mark the culminating event of our One Hundredth Year, and you, our friends and colleagues and neighbors, I most heartily and gratefully welcome. The events of today and tomorrow in a sense are somewhat like a combination of birthday party, Fourth of July, Labor Day week end, and Election Day. If you feel there is undue emphasis on one or the other, your Fourth Form guides will undertake to straighten you out. We are grateful to you for coming; we are eager to have your thinking this afternoon and tonight, and we hope you will find the occasion a profitable and happy one.

"'The Church School in Our Time' is our subject, and it has been chosen rather carefully in order that we may explore the meanings involved in the Church, the Church School, and the Church School in the contemporaneous culture. We believe that all three of these areas will be explored in varying degrees of emphasis by the several speakers in your discussion groups.

"To start us off on this occasion we rejoice in the presence of Paul Tillich. Not in four hundred years has Christianity known such creative fermentation as has arisen during the last thirty years, and no one has contributed more to the careful and accurate significance of this fermentation than Dr. Tillich. Those of us who have studied under him and have read him are grateful to believe that neither we personally nor the institutions of our time will ever be the same because of his contribution to us. Anyone can raise the anthropological questions concerning 'The Church School in Our Time,' but a very small handful of people indeed can deal with the theological answers.

"That we may have firm ground concerning the times, the culture, the conditions under which the Church educates, we need Dr. Tillich, and, praise Heaven, we have him, and here he is: Dr. Tillich, University Professor, Harvard University."

3 educational types -
inductive inculcates traditional symbols
humanistic development of potentialities
generally & individually
technical specific skills no meaning of
existence

DR. TILLICH'S ADDRESS

Theology of Education

MR. HEADMASTER, STUDENTS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: In one of the letters which I received from the headmaster, he wrote: "There is a great deal of talk about philosophy of education but very little talk about theology of education." This sentence encouraged me when I started to think about my speech for the 100th anniversary of this famous school. For I would not have been able to speak about something like methodology of education, not being an expert at all in this field. The only justification for my standing here in this moment is that sometimes, when I thought about the relation of religion and culture, I also considered the problem of education in relation to religion generally and Christianity especially—Christianity seen in the view of a Protestant theologian. But I must add a further restriction, which is at the same time a concretization. It is not so much the problem of Christianity

PAUL JOHANNES TILLICH was born in Starzeddel, Kreis Guben, Prussia, in 1886. He studied in German schools and at the Universities of Berlin, Tübingen, Halle, and Breslau. Before coming to the United States in 1933, he had taught theology and philosophy at the Universities of Berlin, Marburg, Dresden, Leipzig, and Frankfurt-am-Main. In America, he was for twenty-two years Professor of Philosophical Theology at Union Theological Seminary in New York, and since 1955 he has been University Professor at Harvard. He is the author of the following books: *The Religious Situation*; *The Interpretation of History*; *The Protestant Era*; *The Shaking of the Foundations*; *Systematic Theology*; *The Courage to Be*; *Love, Power and Justice*; *Dynamics of Faith*. Dr. Tillich is a member of the Evangelical and Reformed Church. He served as chaplain with the German Army from 1914 to 1918. Honorary degrees have been conferred upon him by the Universities of Halle, Yale, Glasgow, Harvard, and Princeton.

and education to which I want to address myself, as it is the problem of their actual and desirable relation in the present cultural climate. This agrees with the title of our conference: "The Church School *in our Time*." Nevertheless, some basic considerations are requested. Therefore, I want to speak first about different educational aims, and their relation in themselves and in our time, and then about the significance and the limits of the Church School in view of these considerations.

I. *EDUCATIONAL AIMS AND THEIR RELATIONS*

One can distinguish three educational aims, the technical education, the humanistic education, the inducting education. Modern liberal education combines elements of technical with elements of humanistic education. In the Middle Ages, up to the century of the Reformation, technical education was combined with inducting education. The revolutionary movements of the 20th century tried to return to the medieval combination of technical with inducting education. Among the three, technical education, namely the education for skills, special ones like crafts and arts, and general ones like reading, writing, and arithmetic, have existed as long as human beings have taught their children how to use tools skillfully. Yet it was always more than mere technical education. It included many elements of the humanistic way: discipline; subjection to the demands of the object in knowing and handling it; participation in the community of work; subordination to and criticism of the demands of the expert and of the community. All these are elements which belong to the humanistic aim of education, but the humanistic ideal itself goes far beyond them. It can be described as the ideal of the development of all human potentialities, individually and socially. It is the discovery and a main creation of the philosophers and artists of the Renaissance, and it has determined, whether accepted or rejected, the educational history of the last four centuries. Its roots lie not, as theological polemics often contended, in human arrogance, but its roots lie in the basic religious expe-

rience of the early Renaissance, namely the presence of the infinite in everything finite. Every human being, they felt, is a microcosm, a small universe, in whom the large universe is mirrored. As a mirror of the universe and its divine ground, the individual is unique, incomparable, infinitely significant, able to develop in freedom his given endowment. Education is supposed to actualize his potentialities, generally and individually. The aim of the educational process is the humanistic personality in whom as many potentialities as possible are developed, amongst them also technical skills and the religious function.

The humanistic ideal of education has arisen in contrast to the inducting education, of which the medieval culture provides the most important example, important at least for the Western world. Elements of inducting education were never totally absent. The induction of children into their families, with the tradition, symbols, and demands of the family, is the basic form of inducting education. Its aim is not development of the potentialities of the individual, but induction into the actuality of a group, the life and spirit of community, family, tribe, town, nation, church. Such an induction happens spontaneously through the participation of the individual in the life of the group. But it can also be made a matter of intellectual guidance. The form in which this happens is the interpretation of the institutions and symbols of the group in which the child or the new adult member already lives. Induction precedes interpretation; but interpretation makes the induction complete. One of the best examples is the way in which the Old Testament commands parents to tell the story, e.g., of the exodus from Egypt, if the children inquire about the meaning of the festival in which they already participate. The recent demand for more American history in the schools has not humanistic but inducting educational reasons. The life and the symbols of the nation, their past and their traditions, shall be interpreted to those who already participate in them, but who are not yet conscious of their meaning.

It is obvious that the Church School belongs predomina-

antly, though not exclusively, to the inducting type of educational ideas.

But our next question must be, how did the three educational ideas develop in relation to each other and within themselves, and what is their present situation? This question could fully be answered only by a complete history of the modern educational ideas. A short summary of the decisive developments must replace it. One could say that each of the three ideals tried more or less successfully to subject the two others to itself. In the beginning of the modern period, inducting education was in almost uncontested power. The reality into which generation after generation were inducted was the Christian Church, or, more precisely, the "corpus Christianum," the "body Christian," which embraced religion, politics, and culture. The soul of this body, namely the spirit of medieval Christianity, was present and exercised educational functions on every level of man's individual and social life. Even the education for skills was permeated by the religious-cultural substance of the Christian body. Elements of humanistic education were used only for the interpretation of the substance, its symbols and traditions, in order to train the representatives and leaders of the whole body.

When the humanistic ideal of education revolted against the power of the inducting education, a development started which still determines largely our own spiritual destiny. In the beginning, the humanistic education was outspokenly aristocratic. All human potentialities should be developed in the outstanding individual, belonging to the old feudal or the new high bourgeois classes. For the others the training in basic and specialist skills became more and more urgent and was partly done by the foundation of public schools for everybody. The inducting element in these schools was the induction into the morals and beliefs of the bourgeois society. Remnants of the old inducting education were the Church Schools, which, however, had to adapt themselves to the demands for an enlarged technical and an intensified humanistic education. During the 19th century, the technical ideal of education sub-

jected the humanistic ideal largely to itself. Humanism became empty, deprived of creative content. The cultural creations of the past were, and are, used as means for education, but without a focus and a spiritual center. They became goods, the possession of which distinguished the upper classes of society, as material goods did. In this way, the technical aim of education became predominant. Adjustment to the demands of the industrial society became the main educational purpose. The cultural heritage and the religious institutions were not rejected but subjected to this purpose. Yet the industrial society is divided into national units. Therefore, the adjustment to the demands of industrial society became the demand to adjust oneself to a national group within the industrial society. In this way, the emptiness of the late humanistic education was covered up by the national idea. Education to good citizenship seemed to combine all three educational aims. Induction into the spirit of the nation and its institutions, training in general and special skills, mediation of the cultural goods of past and present — such an aim seemed to satisfy all educational requests. The programmes of most schools and the proclamations of most school boards and educational conferences confirm daily the effectiveness of this ideal. How can the Church School stand beside or against its overwhelming influence?

No matter how we answer this question, the educational idea of our present society in this and other Western countries shows heavy problems and deep inner conflicts. Certainly it serves well the aim of inducting the new generations into the demands of the monstrous process of mass production and mass consumption which characterizes our industrial society as a whole, in spite of its national divisions. The new generation receives the general skills in a high perfection; it is being trained in the special skills, partly by vocational schools, but mostly by participation in the different crafts, arts, and professions themselves. And, more than this, there is a large amount of psychological adjustment to the needs of the industrial society in most members of the younger generation.

The way to it in this country — in contrast to the way in Europe — is a kind of permissiveness which makes it possible for the young people to express their willfulness and aggressiveness uninhibited by a stern discipline, but in such a way that after several years an astonishing adjustment to the demands of contemporary society has taken place and the revolutionary spirit of the young ones has evaporated. They have become, almost over night, good citizens, able to fill a position in our competitive society, receptive of cultural goods, especially if they enjoyed with millions of others college education.

The questions, however, must be whether the induction into a national section of the industrial society fulfills the ideal of induction, and whether the mediation of cultural goods fulfills the ideal of humanistic development. Both questions provoke a negative answer. The ideal of induction, as actualized in the medieval society, transcended social and national boundaries. They were not absent; but the ultimate aim of education went beyond them to something ultimate, unconditional, universal. The induction of the Middle Ages was induction into a community with symbols, in which the answers to the questions of human existence and its meaning were embodied. *One can say that induction was initiation, initiation into the mystery of human existence!* This was still the situation long after the Middle Ages, in countries or sections of countries in which the churches, Catholic or Protestant, determined the spirit of education. A public school in eastern Germany around the turn of this century was, as I experienced myself as a boy, in all its procedures an institution to initiate into the Christian-Lutheran answer to the questions of existence. The national element was strong but not decisive. In the secondary school, as I also experienced, the national element prevailed over the religious; and at the universities neither the one nor the other was effective. In this country, the public school has ceased to give an education which in any sense could be called initiation into the mystery of existence and the symbols in which it is expressed. The national ideal can in no way replace an induction

which is initiation. This is the point on which the question of the Church-determined school must be raised.

But another unsolved problem of contemporary education must be brought out, namely its claim to be humanistic. Genuine humanism is a matter of absolute seriousness. It is religious in substance, though cultural in form. It considers the human potentialities as expressions of man's being a mirror of the universe and its creative ground. When the religious substance of humanism disappeared, the mere form was left, abundant, but empty. And today the means of mass communication mediate these empty remnants of former cultural creations to everybody day and night. But we must ask: which of these cultural goods speaks to us as the German poet Rilke felt that the torso of a Greek Apollo spoke to him: "Change thy life!"? Cultural goods have become trimmings, means for having a good time, but nothing ultimately serious, nothing through which the mystery of being grasps us. Humanism has become empty, and so has the humanistic ideal of education.

It is not surprising that this double emptiness, the emptiness of adjustment to the demands of the industrial society, and the emptiness of cultural goods without ultimate seriousness, lead to indifference, cynicism, despair, mental disturbances, early crimes, disgust of life. Neither is it surprising that, in reaction to this emptiness, forces arose which tried to re-establish systems of life and thought which give meaning and spiritual security, and which make inducting education toward a meaning of life possible. This refers to the totalitarian movements of our century; it also refers to the resurgence of ecclesiastical authority, both in the Catholic and in the Protestant sector. One could observe how the European youth before the second World War was longing for symbols in which they could see a convincing expression of the meaning of existence. They desired to be initiated into these symbols which demanded unconditional surrender, even if they showed very soon their demonic-destructive character. The young ones wanted something *absolutely serious* — in contrast to the playing with cultural goods. They wanted something for which they could

sacrifice themselves, even if it was a distorted religious-political aim. From here the place of the Church School in the spiritual geography of our time can be determined. It is a place where the medieval tradition of inductive education is still alive, although the demands of technical education into the structure of our industrial society are acknowledged, but in which the problem of humanistic education is unsolved. It is my intention to dedicate the remaining part of my lecture to a consideration of this problem.

II. *THE INDUCTING AND THE HUMANIST ELEMENT IN THE CHURCH SCHOOL*

In contrast to the medieval situation, the contemporaneous Church School — and church-directed school — is dependent on a small section of the religious life, a special denomination or a special confessional group. It does not represent the spirit of our society as a whole. It is not an expression of its substance, its soul. Therefore, its life, like the life of a theological seminary, can fall into a state of isolation, of concentration on itself, its tradition and symbols. The induction into these symbols and traditions would be ideally an induction of the character of an initiation, but on too small a basis, and therefore not strong enough to give a personal center which can radiate into all sectors of the contemporaneous life. And there is another problem: the pupil who is inducted into the reality and the symbols of a special denomination or confession through the community of the school (which in most cases is a continuation of the community of the family), such a pupil normally comes to a point at which he doubts about, or turns away from, or attacks, the reality and the symbols into which he has been inducted. Living in a world hardly touched by the traditions which have come to him, he inescapably becomes sceptical, both from a religious and from a cultural point of view. And if the invisible power of the spirit of his school was very strong, his reaction against it will be equally strong. Is there a way to overcome these dangers of the Church School?

In order to answer this question, we must ask about the relation of the ideal of inducting education, which underlies the life of the Church School, to the ideal of humanistic education, which is actualized in the Church School only in a limited way. Development of potentialities, not induction into a set of practical and theoretical symbols, is the meaning of humanistic education. This seems to produce an unsolvable conflict. But there is a solution, and it is just the inner conflicts of the Church School itself which point to the solution of the conflict between inducting and humanistic education. Religious induction faces two main difficulties: the one, in the fact that it has to give answers to questions which never have been asked by the child. In speaking of God and the Christ and the Church, or of sin and salvation and the kingdom of God, religious education mediates a material which cannot be received by the mind of those who have not asked the questions to which these words give answers. These words are like stones, thrown at them, from which earlier or later they must turn away. Therefore, every religious education must try to find the existentially important questions which are alive in the minds and hearts of the pupils. It must make the pupil aware of the questions which he already has. After this has been done, he can be shown that the traditional symbols in myth and cult originally were conceived as answers to the questions implied in man's very existence. The correlation of question and answer gives meaning to the answers and opens up the mind of the pupil to the symbols into which religious education has inducted him. But, where questions are asked or provoked, and the answers are interpreted in the light of the question, there humanistic spirit is at work. For humanism starts with the most radical question, the question of being — of being generally and of my own being particularly. The humanistic question is radical; it goes to the roots and does not accept anything whatsoever as being beyond questioning. One has often thought that this is the opposite of religious faith, which has been described as an unquestionable certainty in which all asking comes to rest. Indeed, there are interpretations of

dialogue
is a
humanist
process

faith which make faith a castle surrounded by walls of authority which doubt cannot pierce. But this is certainly not the Biblical or the Protestant concept of faith. In every act of faith, there is risk, and the courage to take this risk, and the necessary doubt which distinguishes faith from mathematical or empirical evidence. Faith, and the radical question with which humanism starts, do not contradict each other, if faith is seen as comprising itself and the doubt about itself. The Church School, on its way of inducting pupils into the symbols and realities of the Christian life, must remain aware of the fact that Christianity has accepted the humanistic principle by identifying Jesus as the Christ with the universal Logos, the creative structure of everything that is. Christianity includes humanism and the radical question of truth which is the first principle of humanism. The inducting education of the Church School can and must include the principle of humanist education, the correlation between question and answer, the radicalism of the question, the opening up of all human possibilities, and the providing for chances which the pupil may develop in freedom.

The second problem of the Church School which helps to answer the question of the relationship between the inducting and the humanistic aim is based on the symbolic character of religious language and the mythical form of all religious propositions. The great art of the religious educator is to transform the primitive literalism with respect to the religious symbols into a conceptual interpretation, without destroying the power of the symbols. Many despair of such a possibility. They either refuse to help the pupil in this necessary transformation or they refuse to give him the traditional symbols before he is able to interpret them conceptually. Both ways are wrong. If you do not impress the religious symbols on the receptive minds of young children, they will experience the full power of the religious symbols only in the rare event of a late conversion. One should not admit a religiously empty space in children up to the moment in which they can fully understand the meaning of the symbols. Nobody can say exactly how much or

how little a young child takes from a ritual act into his unconsciousness, even if he understands intellectually almost nothing of it. Here the Church School and its inducting type of religious education have a decisive function. It opens up the subconscious levels of the children for the ultimate mystery of being.

But this advantage of the Church School would be lost if the primitive reception of the religious symbols were the end of the educational process at which one attempts to keep the pupils. This should never be tried. For very early the humanistic problem makes itself felt. As long as the pupil lives in a dreaming innocence of critical questions, he should not be awakened. But our time is not favorable for a long preservation of such innocence. And if the first critical questions are asked by the child, the first cautious answers must be given. Later on, the questions will become more critical, and the answers must become bolder and more fundamental. The conquest of literalism without the loss of the symbols is the great task for religious education. It brings the humanistic element into the Church School and enables the pupil to remain in the unity of the Church as a mature, critical, and yet faith-determined personality. If the Church School is strong enough to take this humanistic principle into its own life, it can not only maintain its limited place in the present cultural situation, it can become increasingly important in our period of a growing tide of religious concern — to encounter the danger of being swallowed by the almost irresistible forces of our technical civilization — in all realms of life including religion and education.

For the problem of the Church School is more than the problem of the Church School. It is the problem of the relation of Christianity and culture generally and Christianity and education especially. The problem is infinite and must be solved in every generation again. Within this frame, the Church School is like a small laboratory in which the large questions of Church and world can be studied and brought to a preliminary solution, a solution which could become an

inestimable contribution to the solution of the larger problem. On the other hand, it is the duty of the Church School, as of every other institution in which the problem of Christian education is central and concrete, to look beyond its own boundaries, traditions, and laws, at the situation of the Church in the world today, and at the situation of the younger generation in our world and in our Church. We are grateful that this memorable occasion gives us an impulse to do so, and we hope that rich fruits will come out of it.

The Eight Seminars

FOLLOWING Dr. Tillich's address, and luncheon at the New Upper, masters of the School and the School's guests — in all, some two hundred men and women, teachers and administrators in various types of schools and colleges, clergymen, and a few representatives of other professions — met in eight groups of somewhat over twenty each, at various points in the School, and spent the next two hours in informal discussion. Each of the guests had been asked to indicate which of the following topics he preferred to join in discussing: The Religious Side of School Life, Responsibility in School Life, The Academic Side of School Life, or School Life Beyond the Classroom. Of the eight groups, three discussed the first of these topics, two the second, two the third, and one the fourth, the seminars being designated as IA, IB, IC, IIA, IIB, IIIA, IIIB, and IV. The leaders of the eight groups were, respectively, Messrs. Jonathan N. Mitchell of Durham, New Hampshire, Malcolm Strachan of Groton School, John Page Williams of the Diocesan Schools of Virginia, Arthur Perry of Milton Academy, Edward Y. Blewett of the University of New Hampshire, Alan R. Blackmer of Phillips Academy, Andover, Samuel S. Richmond of the Rundlett Junior High School, Concord, New Hampshire, and Archer Harman, Jr., of The Peck School in Morristown, New Jersey.

Some idea of the sense, and scope, and variety, of the eight discussions may be gained from a glance at the list of questions which follows. This is but a partial enumeration of the many topics recorded by the several secretaries as having come up — not necessarily as having received exhaustive treatment, or an "answer" — in their respective meetings. The secretaries, all of them masters at St. Paul's School, were: Messrs. Shoemaker

(IA), Hulser (IB), Mechem (IC), Prudden (IIA), Oates (IIB), Read (IIIA), McDonald (IIIB), and Kellogg (IV).

QUESTIONS DISCUSSED IN THE EIGHT SEMINARS

How does a Church School proceed in teaching a humanistic-centered subject in a way that will avoid literalism without loss of the symbolism of our faith?

How do we secure whole-hearted commitment to Christianity without seriously damaging the young person born and brought up in our culture?

Should a course in different types of philosophies be taught to older students?

Is there danger of the students' falsely identifying the Church School community (as it exists in its present imperfect state) with the ideal Christian community which exists as a goal in the Christian mind?

Does social work — as practiced, for example, in the St. Paul's School Camp at Danbury — foster a type of snobbery?

How does the humanistic approach begin to take over from the inducting approach?

Should Chapel be voluntary?

How can a Church School use religious teaching among boys and parents which will help combat mental disorder, delinquency, and other problems arising out of modern civilization?

How can we toughen the character of students in schools?

Does the toughening of character depend on developing commitment?

What can be done about the difficulty which boys have in accepting religious concepts as the basis of a code by which to live?

How can the School reach a person who wants to be good but is not a believer?

Can responsibility be taught, or is it something one grows into?

What is the meaning of the word "responsibility"?

How much does one owe to the group in contrast to what is owed to one's conscience?

In what ways has responsibility been successfully developed in boys?

Is there a correlation between ability and a sense of responsibility?

How is a sense of responsibility toward the school developed in its graduates?

How can the Church School combine inducting and humanistic aims?

Is culture material usefulness, or is it a condition allowing for the uniqueness of the individual?

What are you going to induct the pupils into?

Is our major job to prepare students for the existing society?
Or for one to come?

How can students be provoked to ask the big, heretical questions?

How can adult civilization transmit to the students meaningful ideas and traditions?

What kinds of ultimate questions are asked in school courses?

In the effort to integrate knowledge, is it more successful to cross-reference in the existing courses or to institute new courses in general humanities?

Is the need for a wider or for a narrower curriculum?

Is the term "Church School" a threat to the soul of the Church School?

To realize Dr. Tillich's ideal, should we not have to overhaul the examination system?

Should "objective" tests be improved, or abolished?

How in the isolation and shelter of a Church School, can boys be inducted in preparation for the world?

How much freedom should a boy have?

How much informal questioning is there between boy and master?

What non-academic freedom is allowed a boy at St. Paul's?

Can one teach tolerance among youth?

Which system of housing is better — the English system, in which boys remain in one house throughout their school

career, or our system, in which boys move from one house to another at the end of each year?
How well off is the unusual, the odd, boy in Church Schools today?
Is sufficient time allowed for the development of artistic talent?
Is the present admissions policy of Church Schools likely to produce successful conformity or stimulating variety?
What is the present attitude of masters toward the unusual in boys, and to what extent does this attitude promote tolerance or intolerance of the unusual by boys?
Should there not be more contact than there now is between schools and universities in this country?
How can boys be prepared in school to resist the cynicism of some college teaching?

There follow brief summaries of the secretaries' reports of the eight seminars. In general, as will be seen, what was discussed — sometimes with particular reference to points made by Dr. Tillich in his address a few hours before, and sometimes not — were aspects and significant details of the subject on which Dr. Tillich had spoken, "The Church School in Our Time," the subject which had been chosen for the entire Symposium, and to which all the speakers, beginning with Dr. Tillich Saturday morning and ending with Mr. Birley at luncheon on Sunday, in fact addressed themselves. What was discussed was how a Church School, how any school believing in the teaching of Jesus and aspiring to be Christian, could best prepare its pupils for life in the present world, to enable them not merely to fit into it, to "adjust" to it, but by positive, even combative, sympathy, to make to it, in accordance with each individual's talent, and in just proportion to his strength and ability, the most ultimately useful contribution. The various seminars, even those on the same sub-division of the main subject — for example, those on The Religious Side of School Life — show an interesting variety in respect to the questions treated, and the manner of approach.

THE RELIGIOUS SIDE OF SCHOOL LIFE

(Three Seminars: IA, IB, IC)

IA

The seminar at first discussed the importance of having children regularly attend services of worship, to provide them with a background of religious symbolism. There was then discussion of the fact that many young people are troubled by the conflict they experience in a Church School between the ethical standards of the school's religious teaching and other standards of the culture in which they have been brought up. It was questioned whether to such young people a school could uncompromisingly teach Christianity without causing damage to them by undermining early loyalties and faith. It was suggested that religious teaching must be presented with openness and breadth of mind, with tact and with charity, consistently with true humanism, which seeks out truth, in Dr. Tillich's phrase, "with absolute seriousness"; and that if the school is sensitive to the desire of young people for allegiance to a faith which transcends themselves, then its education can be both inducting and humanistic.

IB

The first question discussed was whether teachers asked questions — questions relating to religion, of the sort mentioned by Dr. Tillich in his address — when students were still too young for them. It was pointed out that the difficulty of knowing when to begin was complicated by the great diversity of religious experience in any age group. In this connection, it was also pointed out that young students, before they began to ask questions verbally, often in effect expressed them by their reactions to situations, and that it was therefore part of the teacher's task to phrase such questions for the students when they arose, in order that they might be discussed in their proper Christian context. There was discussion of the desirability of teaching a course on different types of philosophies to older

students, for the sake of preparing them to meet the challenges of non-Christian philosophies later in life. The seminar also discussed the danger of Church School students' taking a too local view of Christianity, through identifying the school with the ideal Christian community: they should be frequently reminded that the existing school is but a "pale image" of the ideal, toward which the school and the Christian community are alike striving. The means employed by schools to foster the Christian spirit were discussed, and there was mention of the danger that social work, such as that done in the St. Paul's School Camp at Danbury, could lead to a type of snobbery. The suggestion was made that the awarding of large numbers of prizes in schools can develop "pharisees," and that perhaps a school should award no prize that does not carry with it an added responsibility. Various types of religious instruction were discussed and compared — school courses, regular meetings with clergymen not members of the school's faculty. It was felt that what was so taught in schools could not be expected to be religion itself, so much as the background of religion — religious background, however, being a vital part of the students' cultural heritage.

IC

The seminar first discussed the relationship between the inducting and the humanistic types of education. It was felt that, although induction was fundamental to the beginnings of religious education, still the teacher should continually alternate between the inducting and the humanistic types of instruction, and that as the humanistic approach replaces the inducting approach, the emphasis must be upon preparing the individual to carry on for himself. The seminar also discussed the primary importance in education of loyalty to truth. The faculty must be committed to the truth through their own disciplines, and this commitment must be expressed through the academic work of the school, as well as in its religious activities. Although commitment is not necessarily natural to

a child, and must not be forced upon him, the student must be shown that eventually a commitment will be involved.

RESPONSIBILITY IN SCHOOL LIFE

(Two Seminars: IIA, IIB)

IIA

The seminar discussed two main topics, of which the first was specific examples of responsibility in school situations. For the most part, those representing Church Schools felt that the senior class should have a large share in the administration of the machinery of school life, and that this responsibility should be corporate — each member of the class doing his share and acting in a positive advisory capacity to younger boys. The danger of having a disproportionate part of this load fall on a few “natural leaders” was stressed, and it was felt that the student council should not concern itself with the most important decisions in a school. Electing boys to positions of responsibility seemed to be more effective than appointing them. The second topic discussed in the seminar concerned the responsibility of the teacher to know his students’ spiritual needs and to provide proper answers to questions. Examples of failure were cited, and specific means of attaining these ends were mentioned.

IIB

There were four themes in the discussion: first, the development of individual potentiality; second, the development of the odd, a-normal, boy; third, the responsibility of group life and individual participation therein; fourth, the responsibility of alumni for the continuing life of the school. The sense of the meeting was that a school should be very clear in formulating and announcing its purposes and that it should make sure that what each member does contributes to individual fulfillment.

ACADEMIC ASPECTS

(Two Seminars: IIIA, IIIB)

IIIA

The seminar began with a discussion and definition of the term *academic*, the instructional and curricular side of school life. It then proceeded to discuss how to teach, and what. Emphasis was laid on the importance of the teacher's having certain spiritual qualities, humility, perception, strength of character, and personal conviction, combined with a capacity to encourage in his students not only disciplined learning but also rigorous, independent thought. Toward the end, the dynamic power of love was discussed in its relation to education.

IIIB

The seminar discussed the present comparative unpopularity of Latin in secondary schools, and such means to combat it as, for example, offering general courses in "language" or "humanities" which should clarify the position of the study of Latin as part of the study of civilization. There followed discussion of means by which the teaching of other subjects — mathematics, history, religion, modern languages — could be made more interesting and more obviously significant to present-day students, account being taken of the fact that now, much more than in the past, students were demanding integration of their courses. There was some discussion of whether such integration could better be accomplished by the institution of new courses or by cross-referencing within courses already being taught. It was agreed that this last point was minor — that what most mattered was the capacity of the teacher to promote interest and to stimulate the asking of radical questions — provided that the students be encouraged, by the teacher and by the atmosphere and tradition of the school, to pursue such questions with all the resources at their command. Toward the end of the discussion, there was ques-

tion of whether the present objective type, so-called, of examinations was calculated to promote thorough study. It was felt that "objective" tests could be improved and that, in some cases at least, it would be desirable to combine them with essay-type questions, as is now being done in the College Board Examinations for Advanced Standing.

SCHOOL LIFE BEYOND THE CLASSROOM

(One Seminar)

IV

The seminar on school life beyond the classroom discussed a number of matters — isolation, freedom, tolerance, housing, and preparation for college. Some, at least, felt that the isolation of boarding schools made it necessary that they take positive action to bring students into closer contact with the world. A school in England had made arrangements for its boys to live and work during the summer in a parish in a poor section of a large city. The increasing amount of manual labor done by American students in their vacations was considered a valuable supplement to their school experience. The opinion was expressed that by giving free time for unconventional pursuits and by sympathetic tolerance and encouragement of the unusual, Church Schools should in their own interest encourage the "odd" boy — certainly not to be merely odd, but fruitfully to develop his talents and real interests. The English house system, wherein a boy remains in one house throughout all his years in school, was contrasted with the system obtaining in most American boarding schools, where boys move from one house to another at the end of each year. Attention was called to the need for closer contact than as yet existed in America between the independent secondary schools and independent colleges and universities. It was suggested that there should be more visits to schools by college lecturers, that there should be a greater effort in schools, through seminar

courses and otherwise, to encourage students to question, and to think independently — and also that there ought to be more study of biography in schools than at present. At the end of the meeting, reference was made to Socrates, who “made the student go into the subject, yet never compromised his own views.”

THE ONE HUNDREDTH
Anniversary Symposium
ON
“THE CHURCH SCHOOL
IN OUR TIME”

PLANS for the One Hundredth Anniversary Symposium were made one day in June 1956 when the four members of the panel — George Reath, Jr., of the Sixth Form, Rowland Stebbins, 3d, '55, Robert A. G. Monks, '50, and Edward Dudley Johnson of the Form of 1930 — joined the Rector for luncheon in New York. At this June meeting, there was immediate concurrence on two basic assumptions: that the purpose of the Symposium was not so much to commemorate past achievements as to look boldly and imaginatively into the future, and that its contribution should be primarily philosophic and theoretical in character. It was also agreed that the discussion should be initiated by three papers conceived in such a way as to introduce the audience to the subject of “The Church School in Our Time” within a lengthening perspective and a widening focus. As a member of the present Sixth Form, Mr. Reath would be qualified to discuss the Church as the principal integrating agent in the total life of the School. From the vantage-point of a St. Paul's alumnus at Yale University, Mr. Stebbins would in his paper shift the emphasis to a consideration of the educational advantages of entering college from a Church School. And, finally, Mr. Monks, speaking from the still broader experience of an alumnus in the Harvard Law School, would evaluate the ways in which the Church School prepares future citizens to meet the challenge of life in our time.

The three addresses were independently prepared during the summer; and the authors did not in fact hear each other's papers until they met with the Rector and Professor Johnson, the moderator, at the School, the evening before the Symposium.

The Symposium took place after supper on Saturday evening, October 13th, in Memorial Hall. Several hundred people were

present, including members of the Fifth and Sixth Forms. Mr. Warren made a short speech of introduction and welcome, and the three addresses were then delivered, as follows:

THE CHURCH IN THE CHURCH SCHOOL, by GEORGE REATH, JR.

AT St. Paul's, a tradition of education, both in secular and religious fields, has been developed over the past hundred years. It is to the question of "What is the Church School rooted in, religiously speaking?" that I will devote myself tonight. Before, however, I discuss this question further, I would like to say that this whole question is far too complex for me to even attempt to make an exhaustive analysis of it.

The first building erected on this campus was a chapel. The first curriculum included the following four subjects: Divinity, which is now known here as Sacred Studies, Latin, Greek, and Mathematics. Although methods of teaching these subjects have changed with the passage of time, especially in Sacred Studies with changes in religious thinking made necessary by events of history such as the theory on evolution of Charles Darwin, all these courses have remained on the School's academic program since its inception. The Sacred Studies Department is as well staffed and as costly to maintain as any other department, and the Chapel, beautiful and awe-inspiring as it is, is as expensive to keep up as any building on the campus, and more expensive than most. Then, too, there is the atmosphere of tolerant Episcopalian opinion which has prevailed here from the days of Dr. Henry Coit, the first Rector, and Dr. Shattuck. It is significant to note that Dr. Shattuck was a doctor of medicine, and that the first thought for this school came from this devout layman. St. Paul's then, can boast one hundred years' tradition in the Church.

A Church School is, by definition, "a community which makes the worship and service of God the center of its life. It believes that only through accepting the relationship between God and man as the center of all human experience can man

hope to understand and fulfill the purpose of his creation. It believes that all study informs religion and that religion informs and completes all learning and experience.” Thus it follows that the Chapel as the focal point of the worship and service of God is at the center of every Church School. What, however, does the Chapel express to the Church School student?

The Chapel expresses Christianity as we know it. It embodies thousands of years of religious tradition, going back to the days of Abraham, Isaac, and Moses. For every member of a Church School community it expresses a need for something above and beyond himself, greater than himself, in which he can place his trust. In other words, the Chapel acts as a foundation stone, not only for the school itself, but for each member of the school community. The Chapel embodies tradition in which the Church School is rooted.

We should now ask ourselves this question: Why was this school — why was any school, for that matter — founded specifically as a Church School? Dr. Shattuck, as the founder of this school — and the founders of other similar institutions — had a strong conviction that Christianity should be the dominant spiritual force in Western culture, and eventually, throughout the world. Therefore, there was, and is, a need to educate young men in the Christian way of life, and to offer them the opportunity to accept for themselves the Christian revelation. The founders must have felt that the most stable leaders and citizens were those with not only a thorough knowledge of science, the classics, the humanities, and history, but also with a faith, a religion, upon which they could depend to carry them through times of stress. A solidly founded faith breeds confidence in action. The ultimate aim of the Church School, then, is to produce young men of Christian faith, who are endowed with an inner serenity and stability.

A Church School education is rooted in two cultures, the Greek and the Hebrew, while a secular education is rooted in one, the Greek. The Greek ideal was knowledge for the sake of gaining wisdom — the seeking of knowledge about the nature

of the world, and about the gods, and consequently, the development of a theology and a cosmology, as well as the formulating of theories about the origin of the world and of the gods. The Hebrew ideal, on the other hand, was characterized by commitment as a people to one God, Jehovah. Through its Sacred Studies department, the Church School offers knowledge about religion, and criticism of it, in keeping with the Greek ideal. Through the Chapel, the school can offer the knowledge of religion, and the opportunity for self-commitment to this religion, in keeping with the Hebrew ideal.

When the organic relationship between the Sacred Studies classroom and the Chapel is maintained, I have every belief that the Church School can succeed in its mission to produce young men of the Christian faith. However, all that the school can do is to offer the student the opportunity, and a rationale, for self-commitment. If the student, having seen through the classroom how Christianity has affected the lives of past men and nations, after having studied the basic precepts of the religion, and after having seen, through the Chapel, how Christianity can fit his own life, should, perchance, reject the religion, he will, all the same, have gained much from his religious education. He will have been forced to think about his religion, because rejection of anything implies at least some thought about it or its alternative. In other words, the student should graduate from the Church School having already accepted Christianity, or having at least considered his religion sufficiently to reject Christianity intelligently. The problem is more, however, than the acceptance or rejection of a way of life; it is one of the acceptance or rejection of the roots of Western culture. The Church School believes that Western culture finds its secular roots in the teachings of Plato and Aristotle, and its spiritual roots in the Hebrew-Christian tradition. If the student rejects Christianity, he also rejects the spiritual foundations of Western culture. In any case, the Church School graduate should have been brought face to face with the problems of his own personal religion, and of what he considers to be the basis of his culture. The Church

School can do no more than to stimulate its students to serious thought about religion, inasmuch as the final decision of acceptance or rejection lies with them.

The most valuable contribution of the "Church" aspect of the Church School to the school is that it teaches the individual to accept his fellows, as well as himself; for God, the perfect being, can accept mankind in all its imperfection. In other words, the relationship between God and man is at the root of all well-being. The desire to accept his fellows for what they are is the basic quality of the man of inner serenity whom I mentioned earlier. Parenthetically, I do not feel, as some do, that acceptance is resignation; this negative concept distorts the true meaning of the word. Acceptance is reception — the willing reception of one's contemporaries into one's heart as being worth-while creatures, for all their flaws. If a man can understand that God can accept him, then he is able to accept himself, and, consequently, to accept others.

What is, in conclusion, the essence, the true nature of the Church School? Is it the teaching that the relationship between God and man is the center of all human experience, or is it the preparation of future college students? I think that the essence of the Church School is a combination of these. The teachings of the Church are what distinguish the Church School from all other schools, and the presentation of these teachings as a complement to a secular education, is the basic motivation of the Church School.

THE CHURCH SCHOOL, by ROWLAND STEBBINS, 3D

EVERY school wants to give to its students the solid intellectual foundation for their work in college. The Church School also wants to give them a personal religious conviction, a strength of character which will enable them to take on exceptional responsibilities in whatever they do. What opportunities, then, does the Church School have to help a boy develop this conviction and strength of character?

We may divide this into two questions of which the first is:

what opportunities to do this lie in the courses offered and in their instruction? It is undoubtedly true that boys of boarding school age will be impressed by whatever philosophical ideas they study. I myself can remember being very much impressed by the Greek conception of human nature after studying Greek here for four years. However, I was impressed by other ideas as well, and I think that in the course of its development a boy's mind passes through a great many stages of philosophical thought, and that this is part of the broadening of intellectual understanding.

However, somewhere in here should lie the opportunity for the Church School to impress its students with Christian thinking.

Unfortunately, this opportunity is limited. The school cannot present Christianity dogmatically, as Roman Catholicism is presented in catechism to those about to be confirmed; the minds of boys at sixteen and seventeen are too inquiring and too subtle to accept or even to tolerate this. Furthermore, the study of religion and philosophy in college would probably shatter any belief acquired in this way.

Instead, the school will present Christianity to be studied objectively, in much the same way, for instance, as it might present Buddhism. It will be a study of what Christians believe and the student will not have to be concerned with what he himself believes. This is the way of modern education in general, and it is certainly the approach in the universities, where one's individual thoughts are to be carefully distinguished from those under study. The result of this approach, however, is to divorce the religious or moral thought which is a subject of study from religious or moral thought which involves a personal conviction. The two become separated and indeed modern education tends to cast off responsibility for the latter. In college there is no concern for the influence on a student of such a thesis as that of the anthropologist, Ruth Benedict, namely, that the religion or morals of an individual are entirely dependent upon the culture in which that individual lives. If this is the educational approach of the colleges, it may

as well be that of the Church School. On the other hand, if the Church School teaches in this way, it will find that the more its students encounter philosophical or religious ideas, the less they know what to think, until they become relatively unimpressed by any at all, so much has their intellectual understanding been broadened.

This is the limitation of the Church School's opportunity to impress its students with Christian thinking in its classroom instruction. It essentially consists of a certain intellectual detachment, cultivated by the modern approach to education. It allows personal conviction to lie undeveloped while a boy passes through his education.

This is what the Church School wants to avoid, but unfortunately, as an educational institution, it cannot avoid letting this happen inside the classroom. It may give its students a greater knowledge of religious and philosophical ideas, but, as it does this, it increases more and more this intellectual detachment.

But what about outside the classroom? This is the second part of my original question. What opportunities does the Church School have, as a boarding school, to help a boy develop conviction and strength of character?

It is one of the most basic concepts of the Christian religion that the individual is constantly engaged in a struggle within himself against temptation. The validity of Christianity largely rests upon the fact that this is not only a concept of the Christian religion but also a concept of life. If it were thought of in humanistic terms, it would be the concept of the individual constantly engaged in a struggle to cope with the all but defeating pressures of human existence. It sees life as continually pouring down on each person not only joys but hardships, making it necessary for him to find the strength to extend himself to meet these difficulties. It is therefore the first obligation of a Christian Church School to put into the life which it constructs for boys in its small community the kind of pressures which will help a boy to understand and believe this Christian concept of life.

However, since the Church School is a boarding school, it tends to suffer from one unfortunate characteristic of boarding school life. A boy exists in a small community where social, athletic, or academic success is readily recognized and often honored. This sort of success is measured relatively to the other boys in the school, and a boy tends to measure his own worth as an individual by his success in any of these three fields. It is a superficial, irreligious, and unphilosophical estimate of human values, but it is often satisfying enough to prevent a search for any deeper evaluation. There is an enormous temptation for a boy to allow his abilities and talents to give him a certain satisfactory status than which he will not bother to try to do any better. Such a point of view is far from that of the Christian concept of life I have just described. How then can the Church School impress its boys with this Christian concept, with the idea that they will always be required to extend their abilities and talents?

It is only in the academic field that the Church School can impress upon a boy the reality of this Christian concept of life. Only here can the school offer a student repeated challenges such that he will be forced to extend himself, not only in order to improve but merely to maintain his status. The frame of mind which has the strength of character behind it to meet such challenges is not only what the Church School is trying to cultivate as a Christian concept of life, but it is also a frame of mind which the boy will find necessary when he goes to college. There it is not the quantity but the quality of work which puts pressure on the freshman. He can write a paper in the same length of time at college as at school, but he must adjust his mind to more rigorous and more perceptive thinking and analysis before he can expect it to be considered as good a paper as he thinks he is capable of writing. I have seen boys fail to adjust in this way and suffer enormously in their academic standing; I have also seen them make the adjustment, but not without a certain frustration and despair at the prospect of having to meet this new challenge.

I originally asked this question: what opportunities does the

Church School have to help a boy develop conviction and strength of character? The answer to this question is that the opportunities lie not so much in the field of academic instruction — that is, in what is taught. Rather the greatest opportunity lies in the school's offering its education in such a way that its students will be convinced of the reality of the Christian concept of life as a continual demand upon each individual to strengthen and to extend himself. Only with this Christian conception in mind, can the Church School student be expected to understand and believe that "all study informs religion and that religion informs and completes all learning and experience."

THE CHURCH SCHOOL IN OUR TIME, by ROBERT
A. G. MONKS

THE role of the Church School in our times needs clarification and restatement. This paper conceives the task of the Church School to be the production of leaders for the community who are motivated by the Christian ethic. The Christian ethic for the purposes of this paper is taken to include the conviction that man is responsible to God for his stewardship on earth and will be accountable to him for the use he has made of his life.

Listen to the reflections of a celebrated fictitious Church School graduate, John P. Marquand's H. M. Pulham:

"I wish that I were back. I have often said that to myself before I have gone to sleep. I wish that I were back, where there was someone like the Rector to tell me what to do; someone who knew absolutely what was right and what was wrong, someone who had an answer to everything. There was always an answer at school, and a good answer. No matter what the world was like, you could still play the game. I wish to God that I were back."

Harry Pulham is stating an attitude that, in his own terms, is far from unfavourable to his old school, and that is in many

ways creditable to him. Pulham has an obvious desire to do the right thing. But he has not learned to do his own thinking and still looks to the Rector for leadership. Further, he does not realize that the Christian ethic talked about at school can guide and motivate him in the world outside. These failures constitute a fundamental indictment of Pulham's school as a Church School. Were it a non-church school, the indictment would be less severe. One must realize that the non-church school may have just as good facilities as the Church School, just as long a waiting list, just as good teachers — it can give just as good academic training. In brief, the non-church school can provide the student with equal education in all fields except that which is the distinguishing characteristic of the Church School — the teaching and the conscious attempt to live a Christian life.

How many times have you encountered an Old Boy returning to his school declaiming sincerely on the value of its chapel services, while acknowledging that he rarely, if ever, goes to church elsewhere? This points up one problem inherent in a Church School education — School and Church often become so identified in the student's mind that he does not recognize the Christian way of life as a force of equal validity outside of the School. When Christianity becomes synonymous with the Old School, Christian motive loses its power for the world outside. This identification of School and Christian living is good as far as it goes, but when it is not outgrown following graduation, as is often the case with Old Boys, it is an attitude that will not do for our times.

The nation is crying for leaders. President Eisenhower recently spelled out this need on the national level — the need is equally great at all levels of life in both state and community. The Church School must consciously attempt to develop leaders. If the Church Schools do not produce them, who will? However, the Church School graduate of today is faced with the problem of incredible competition at every stage of his life. No longer will every door open to the son of a wealthy and influential man. Having family connections is no

longer a sufficient credential to being admitted to a good college; it is entirely irrelevant to being admitted to a graduate or professional school.

But the school will fall down on the job if it merely enables its graduates to face the competition of college entrance. No longer does leadership consist of drifting through college into a comfortable family job. The graduate will have to prove in tough competition his right to exercise leadership. He cannot sit complacently in the shadow of his ancestors' accomplishments. And that leadership must not be simply an individual success story, but the emphatic exercising of leadership for the value and good and advancement of the community. This vision was caught and made conspicuously effective over several decades by Dr. Peabody of Groton, as is evidenced by the long roll of his graduates who have assumed important leadership in public service in state and nation. His vision must be nurtured and preserved. A tough-minded morality and sense of dedication is the essential prerequisite for taking a leader's place in our times.

The state of these times makes a Christian basis for this leadership particularly necessary. The Church School graduate will fast come to realize that he lives in a world of ethical relativity and amorality. Mere perusal of the current fiction best sellers in this country, cursory knowledge of the divorce statistics, and the prevailing attitude toward evading taxes give some indication of the moral decay of the times. These are just the pitfalls of the world in which he will live, and in which, as never before, he must articulate a positive creed for himself and his nation.

We are locked in mortal struggle with Communism for the ideological control of the world. Russell Davenport's *The Dignity of Man* spells out the nation's position with brilliant clarity:

“The United States has inherited the leadership of the free world because of her vast power. It is well to remind ourselves, perhaps, that it was for no other cause. We do not possess leadership today by reason of any great clarity

of our doctrine of freedom. Our contemporary poets have not opened up new vistas for man, nor have our philosophers conspicuously enlightened him. We are where we are because of our immense accomplishments in the world of 'things' and the immense power growing out of such accomplishments. The question that the free world cannot help asking is whether we have enlightenment commensurate with that power — whether we are in fact fit for leadership. Until we answer that question, we cannot effectively lead the free world."

While not expressed in Christian terms, this challenge is in its essence Christian. Once again it is the Church School that must produce the answers; it is their graduates who must articulate our nation's positive philosophy — the Christian concept of the dignity of the individual and the democratic ideal of equal rights for all. The Church School's task is to produce for our times young men educated and steeped in these great ideals, which our nation must manifest further if we are to deserve to continue the leadership of the free world, or, indeed, if we are to be given the chance.

Recognizing these twin needs of leadership and the Christian ethic, how is the school to meet them? Two hopeful lines of approach suggest themselves: first, it should move nearer to Dr. Drury's great maxim "School life is not like real life, it is real life"; and, second, it should determine to treat each student as an individual and to provide him with as ideal conditions as possible in which his ethical ideals and leadership qualities may grow.

Church Schools are organized on the basis of student responsibility, and this, in itself, is all to the good. As the student gets seniority in a school — or, as Pulham would say, "as he plays the game" — he gets responsibilities. But the doing of a duty easily becomes equated in his mind with the receiving of a privilege. A supervisor is responsible for the boys in his house, and he has certain privileges. The president of the school has enormous responsibilities, and he has the privileges and recog-

niton to go with them. There is a tangible reward resulting from doing a job well. While the student comes to feel a sense of responsibility, he often also expects recognition. When this boy leaves school, he enters a world where very often the only reward for doing well is a feeling of inner satisfaction. Unless the Church School has taught the student that he is his own arbiter before God, and that he will achieve happiness only in the sense of living a Christian life, it will fail as Harry Pulham's school failed. There must be extraordinary emphasis on living in a Christian way simply because it is Christian, and not in the hope or anticipation of tangible reward.

Traditionally, religious education in the Church School has centered on the pure mechanics of giving each class the essentials of the Christian faith and a grasp of the fundamentals of the Episcopal tradition. This is not enough. We live in a world of conflict, and students must be taught to cope with conflicts. There must be more areas both in living and in thinking where the conflict and strain characteristic of the outside world are significantly present. What use is a thorough knowledge of Christian ethics which has not been challenged, tested, and proved in the furnace of real living?

How is the school to provide each student with experience in coping with conflict? The group approach, as represented by small classes and team sports, is, of course, of essential value in teaching the student how to get along with other people. However, it must be supplemented. Social pressure, timidity, and laziness are all protected under the group system. Direct contact and the necessity to think on a given subject both suggest the benefits of a system of individual tutorial meetings. The mechanics of the school can be arranged to provide for a regular tutorial system. There must be some place in the curriculum where a student is challenged, and made to think deeply on a given subject, and where he can resolve and develop his own ideas. You may say, this is all very nice, but where are we going to find the time to do this — our faculty are already taxed to the extreme. I reply simply that, whenever you have competition for time, that which is most im-

portant must prevail. The time must be taken. Even if you have larger or fewer classes, even if you take some time away from athletics or extracurricular activities, this time must be taken.

What good is the fine academic training to which so much time and expense are devoted, if the student does not also get a measure of wisdom? How profitable has the Church School been to a student if it has not helped him think out the ethical basis of his own life? This ethical training is so important that the school must not permit its students to graduate without having benefit of all the assistance within the school's power to bestow.

A Church School is what it is because it teaches and practices the Christian way of life. In the language of the Parable of the Talents, the typical Church School student is one who has been given ten talents by the Lord; he must come to feel the duty of using them well, and thus paying them back. He must learn that all his advantages of birth and education are as nothing unless they are put to the sincere service of his fellow man. Surely, this is the goal of the Church School in our times, and every phase of the school life must be directed to the effective accomplishment of this one essential goal.

THE DISCUSSION

When Mr. Monks, the third of the panel speakers, had delivered his address, Professor Johnson, the moderator, addressed the meeting. Inviting the three authors to take issue with him later if he did their papers injustice, he stated, by way of analysis and summary, that they had just pointed out that the Church School in Our Time has three responsibilities:

- (1) the responsibility for the individual in his relationship with his Maker, his God — the responsibility for surveillance over the individual student's personal faith — this responsibility being presumably fulfilled through the chapel services and the courses in Sacred Studies;
- (2) the responsibility for the individual in his relationship with society (Professor Johnson was thinking, he said, in this con-

nection, of the life of the school outside the classroom — school government, athletics, and so on; and he reminded the meeting of Dr. Tillich's phrase that morning, 'The school is a microcosm. . .');

- (3) the responsibility for the individual in his relationship to himself — fulfilled in the classroom, not simply by the provision of facts, but by intellectual discipline — in the sense that Socrates proposed that the highest goal of man is to know himself, or that Cardinal Newman proposed, "The true motive for education is the disinterested quest for wisdom."

The three papers, Professor Johnson went on to point out, declared that in respect to the discharge of each of these responsibilities, there is a danger attendant:

- (1) the danger that personal faith will not endure — that it will produce but a cloistered and fugitive virtue, blooming in the school only to wither in the rationalism of the university and of the world;
- (2) the danger that success in school activities outside the classroom will lead a student to settle, as Mr. Stebbins said, for "a satisfactory status" — to a fruitless compromise in terms of power, of prestige;
- (3) the danger that intellectual discipline, when the student reaches the negative relativism of the outside world — including, particularly, the university — will lead only to his becoming unduly detached, irresponsible, cynical, ultimately to reach a state of despair.

Now, Professor Johnson continued, if you accept these three relationships and the danger attendant on each, you also notice a very curious thing: that each of the opportunities offered a Church School student — in chapel and Sacred Studies courses, in extra-curricular school life, by the school's academic, intellectual, training — if fully taken advantage of, proves an antidote to the danger attendant on the other opportunities, viz:

- (1) The danger of a student's developing "a cloistered and fugitive virtue" will be obviated if he enters fully into the extra-curricular life of the school.
- (2) The danger that a student, after success in the school's extra-curricular activities, will settle for "status," for power, is offset, if he rigorously and devotedly addresses himself to the intellectual opportunities offered him by the school.

- (3) The danger of the brilliant student's ending in discouraged futility is overcome, if in school he completes his spiritual faith, in a true and combative sense.

In view of the foregoing analysis of the addresses the meeting had just heard by Messrs. Reath, Stebbins, and Monks, Professor Johnson then proposed for the evening's discussion what he said might well be the \$64,000 question — namely, "Does a Church School, such as St. Paul's, graduate better-directed individuals than other schools?" He asked if this question provoked any response.

For the next hour or more, there was continuous and lively interchange of question and answer. Somewhat over a dozen, more than half of whom were members of the Sixth Form, or recent graduates of St. Paul's, participated, besides the members of the panel.

Early in the discussion, several speakers having agreed that a Church School did give "direction" to its graduates — in all the departments of school life — a Sixth Former, speaking from the floor, asked to know, from some representative of a non-church school present, how such schools felt about giving "a sense of direction" to their graduates: whether they sought to impart one, and, if so, how.

Mr. Warren rose to speak to that question — not as Rector of St. Paul's School, but as a graduate of a public high school. He pointed out that the public schools in America have not only the right, but the legal necessity, to thrust much of this problem of direction back to where it really belongs — to the home, and to the parish church. He thought that those who, like him, had gone to public schools, had been forced to find their broader adjustment to life mainly through those two resources.

The moderator then inquired of Mr. Warren what, in his opinion, the Church School could do for a boy, more than his family and the parish church could do, if they both fulfilled their function. Mr. Warren, in reply, briefly made two points: first, that in a boarding school a boy was both allowed and required, more than in other communities, to act his age — he was not expected to behave as if he were older than he was, neither was he permitted to act as if he were younger; and, secondly, that most boys were better off if there were more than the two people provided by nature to take a parental interest in them — an advantage of a place like St. Paul's was that a boy could have at least half a dozen "parents."

A recent graduate of St. Paul's inquired how well Mr. Warren thought a school like St. Paul's could fulfill the function of a parish church — whether something of a clergyman's pastoral capacity

was not lost by his being at the same time a teacher in the school. Mr. Warren stated that, from his point of view, that of a clergyman who had worked twenty years in parish churches before coming to a Church School, he could see vastly less difference than he had expected to see between the relationship of a clergyman to parishioners of his church, and his relationship to boys in a school where he also was a teacher. The boys might see a distinction, but Mr. Warren did not think they did. In either case, there were acceptances and rejections of the clergyman as pastor.

From this point on, criticism of Church Schools — specifically, in regard to whether the “direction” they had given their graduates was adequate — played a prominent part in the discussion. Some speakers felt that this “direction” was not adequate. The criticism was related in part to a statement the moderator had made earlier in the meeting: colleagues of his at Princeton had remarked to him that some St. Paul’s graduates who had been particularly prominent and effective in the extracurricular life at the School showed a tendency to avoid such activities in college. Opinions expressed in the meeting differed as to whether this was due to a self-satisfied “settling for status,” or to distaste, perhaps only temporary, from having been surfeited with non-academic problems and responsibilities in school. A speaker from the floor recalled Mr. Monks’ mention, in his address, of John P. Marquand’s fictitious character, H. M. Pulham, who in middle life wished himself back in his old school, where the Rector would have told him just what to think and do. Pulham’s education had been imperfect, in that, though he had been taught to admire Christian ideals, he had not succeeded in digesting them and making them his own: the “direction” he had received had been “outer,” not “inner.” It was also brought out by a member of the Sixth Form that the criticism of Church Schools implied in Mr. Marquand’s novel had been made explicitly in the history of St. Paul’s School — written by Arthur S. Pier of the Form of 1890 and published in 1934.

No denial or evasion of such charges was undertaken at the Symposium. On the contrary, it was tacitly assumed that, however good or bad Church Schools had been in the past, the times required that they be good now, and in the future. There was clear demand for the imparting in Church Schools of “inner direction,” of “tough-mindedness,” of “combative faith.” At one point, there having been some talk of “leadership,” a speaker in some excitement declared from the floor, “I wanted to say that one of the things a Church School can do is occasionally not go around making so many *leaders*, but make some good old-fashioned *eccentrics* who don’t care whether

anybody is following or whether they're leading or being followed . . .” In spirit, that was not far from what the historian of St. Paul’s School had wanted to say, and said, at the close of his book, a quarter-century before.

It is of interest, and important for the future, that to a very large extent the young men who at this Symposium were pleading for a greater development of individuality and personal conviction in American schools related their hopes to improvements on the academic, quite as much as on the religious, side of school life. Professor Johnson had called attention, early in the meeting, to the coincidence that two of the panel speakers (though each of the three had prepared his address independently of the others) had used the quotation, “All study informs religion, and religion informs and completes all learning and experience.” And at the end of the meeting, he spoke of Dr. Peabody of Groton — the record of several of whose graduates had been cited as an instance of what could be accomplished by a Church School; and of Dr. Arnold of Rugby, stating, in regard to the latter, that men who had been boys at Rugby when Arnold was there had radically changed the whole tone of life in Mid-Victorian England. He pointed out that, in Arnold’s Rugby, religious training permeated every branch of the life of the school, and also that the final examinations set by Arnold for his Sixth Formers showed that quite obviously knowledge was being brought to the test of the crucial intellectual issues of that day.

Commenting on the evening as a whole, and on the three papers in particular, Professor Johnson said he felt that the sights had been set very high, and that he felt very proud of his school.

Professor Johnson then called the Rector’s attention to the fact that it was nearing ten o’clock, the hour that had been set for ending the meeting. Mr. Warren expressed gratitude to Professor Johnson, to Messrs. Reath, Stebbins, and Monks, and to those who, as he said, had had the good sense and the temerity to speak from the floor — and apologized for having spoken from the floor so much himself. He expressed the belief that praise and criticism were alike good for St. Paul’s School, and hoped it would always have much of both. Dismissing the assemblage, he invited all to join in partaking of refreshments in the basement of the School House.

There follows the Order of Service, as it was printed for each member of the congregation at Morning Chapel on Sunday, October 14th; and the Order of Service is followed by the full text of the sermon preached at this service by the Bishop of Massachusetts.

THE CHURCH SCHOOL IN OUR TIME

A SERVICE

AT THE

ACADEMIC CELEBRATION

OF THE

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY

of

THE FOUNDING OF ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL



THE CHAPEL OF SAINT PETER AND SAINT PAUL

CONCORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

OCTOBER FOURTEENTH

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX

ORDER OF PROCESSION

Crucifer and Taperers

The Rector

The Bishop of Massachusetts

The Bishop of New Hampshire

Bearers of the School Flag and the Service Flag

The Choir

Bearers of the Church Flag and the National Flag

The Readers

The Faculty

THE PROCESSION

*The Rector shall read the Call to Worship,
all standing.*

COME YE, and let us go up unto the mountain of the Lord,
to the house of the Lord our God, and he will teach us of his
ways, and we will walk in his paths.

Praise the Lord, ye servants; O praise the name of the Lord.

People: The Lord's Name be praised.

All shall sing the following Hymn.

LEONI

TRADITIONAL MELODY,
ARR. MEYER LYON, C. 1770

THE God of Abraham praise,
Who reigns enthroned above;
Ancient of everlasting days,
And God of love;
To him uplift your voice,
At whose supreme command
From earth we rise, and seek the joys
At his right hand.

There dwells the Lord, our King,
The Lord, our Righteousness,
Triumphant o'er the world and sin,
The Prince of Peace;
On Sion's sacred height
His kingdom he maintains,
And, glorious with his saints in light,
For ever reigns.

The God who reigns on high
The great archangels sing,
And "Holy, Holy, Holy," cry,
"Almighty King!
Who was, and is, the same,
And evermore shall be:
Eternal Father, great I AM,
We worship thee."

The whole triumphant host
Give thanks to God on high;
"Hail, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost!"
They ever cry;
Hail, Abraham's God and mine!
I join the heavenly lays;
All might and majesty are thine,
And endless praise. Amen.

THOMAS OLIVERS, C. 1770

THE LESSONS

Then shall be read a Lesson from the Old Testament.

R E A D E R

ROBERT BIRLEY, M.A., D.C.L., C.M.G.

BUT where shall wisdom be found? and where is the place of understanding? Man knoweth not the price thereof; neither is it found in the land of the living. The depth saith, It is not in me: and the sea saith, It is not with me. It cannot be gotten for gold, neither shall silver be weighed for the price thereof. It cannot be valued with the gold of Ophir, with the precious onyx, or the sapphire. The gold and the crystal cannot equal it: and the exchange of it shall not be for jewels of fine gold. No mention shall be made of coral, or of pearls: for the price of wisdom is above rubies. The topaz of Ethiopia shall not

equal it, neither shall it be valued with pure gold. Whence then cometh wisdom? and where is the place of understanding? Seeing it is hid from the eyes of all living, and kept close from the fowls of the air. Destruction and death say, We have heard the fame thereof with our ears. God understandeth the way thereof, and he knoweth the place thereof. For he looketh to the ends of the earth, and seeth under the whole heaven; To make the weight for the winds; and he weigheth the waters by measure. When he made a decree for the rain, and a way for the lightning of the thunder: Then did he see it, and declare it; he prepared it, yea, and searched it out. And unto man he said, Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding. JOB 28:12-28.

All shall sing the following Hymn.

ST. ANNE

W. CROFT, 1708

O GOD, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come,
Our shelter from the stormy blast,
And our eternal home.

Before the hills in order stood,
Or earth received her frame,
From everlasting thou art God,
To endless years the same.

A thousand ages in thy sight
Are like an evening gone;
Short as the watch that ends the night
Before the rising sun.

O God, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come,
Be thou our guide while life shall last,
And our eternal home. Amen.

ISAAC WATTS, 1719; *based on Psalm 90*

*Then shall be read a Lesson from the
New Testament.*

R E A D E R

THE REVEREND PAUL JOHANNES TILLICH, DR. PHIL.,
LIC. THEOL., D.D., L.H.D.

AND he spake a parable unto them, saying, The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully: And he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits? And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns, and build greater; and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry. But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided? So is he that layeth up treasures for himself, and is not rich toward God.

ST. LUKE 12:16-21.

THEREFORE, whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it.

ST. MATTHEW 7:24-27.

*The Lesson ended, all shall sing
the following Hymn.*

REGENT SQUARE

H. SMART, 1867

CHRIST is made the sure foundation,
Christ the head and corner-stone,
Chosen of the Lord, and precious,
Binding all the Church in one;
Holy Sion's help for ever,
And her confidence alone.

All that dedicated city,
Dearly loved of God on high,
In exultant jubilation
Pours perpetual melody:
God the One in Three adoring
In glad hymns eternally.

To this temple, where we call thee,
Come, O Lord of Hosts, to-day;
With thy wonted loving-kindness
Hear thy servants as they pray,
And thy fullest benediction
Shed within its walls alway.

Here vouchsafe to all thy servants
What they ask of thee to gain;
What they gain from thee, for ever
With the blessed to retain,
And hereafter in thy glory
Evermore with thee to reign. Amen.

LATIN, C. 7TH CENT.

THE SERMON

THE RIGHT REVEREND NORMAN BURDETT NASH, D.D., L.H.D.
BISHOP OF MASSACHUSETTS

AN ACT OF FAITH AND PRAYER

O F F I C I A N T

THE REVEREND MATTHEW MADISON WARREN, D.D., RECTOR

I BELIEVE in God the Father Almighty,
Maker of heaven and earth:
And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord:
Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost,
Born of the Virgin Mary:
Suffered under Pontius Pilate,
Was crucified, dead, and buried:

He descended into hell;
The third day he rose again from the dead:
He ascended into heaven,
And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father
Almighty:
From thence he shall come to judge the quick
and the dead.
I believe in the Holy Ghost:
The holy Catholic Church:
The Communion of Saints:
The Forgiveness of sins:
The Resurrection of the body:
And the Life everlasting. Amen.

Minister: The Lord be with you.

People: And with thy spirit.

Minister: Let us pray.

Here all shall kneel.

ALMIGHTY God, we beseech thee with thy gracious favor to behold our universities, colleges, and schools, that knowledge may be increased among us, and all good learning flourish and abound. Bless all who teach and all who learn; and grant that in humility of heart they may ever look unto thee, who art the fountain of all wisdom; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

O GOD, who through the love and labor of many hast built us here a goodly heritage in the name of thy servant St. Paul, and hast crowned our School with honor and length of days: For these thy gifts, and for thyself, we thank thee, and for past achievements and future hopes; beseeching thee that both we and all who follow after us may learn those things on earth, of which the knowledge continues in thy heaven; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Then shall all say the Lord's Prayer.

OUR Father, who art in heaven,
Hallowed be thy Name.
Thy kingdom come.
Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven.
Give us this day our daily bread.
And forgive us our trespasses,
As we forgive those who trespass against us.
And lead us not into temptation,
But deliver us from evil.
For thine is the kingdom,
And the power, and the glory,
For ever and ever. Amen.

MINISTER

THE grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God,
and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all ever-
more. *Amen.*

THE OFFERTORY

OFFICIANT

THE RIGHT REVEREND CHARLES FRANCIS HALL, D.D., LL.D.
BISHOP OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

*The Bishop shall say the Offertory Sentence,
the People standing.*

Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your
good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

ST. MATTHEW 5:16

Still standing, all shall sing the following Hymn.

ANCIENT of Days, who sittest throned in glory,
To thee all knees are bent, all voices pray;
Thy love has blessed the wide world's wondrous story
With light and life since Eden's dawning day.

O holy Father, who has led thy children
In all the ages with the fire and cloud,
Through seas dry-shod, through weary wastes bewildering,
To thee in reverent love our hearts are bowed.

O holy Jesus, Prince of Peace and Saviour,
To thee we owe the peace that shall prevail,
Stilling the rude wills of men's wild behavior,
And calming passion's fierce and stormy gale.

O Holy Ghost, the Lord and the Life-giver,
Thine is the quickening power that gives increase:
From thee have flowed, as from a mighty river,
Our faith and hope, our fellowship and peace.

O Triune God, with heart and voice adoring,
Praise we the goodness that doth crown our days;
Pray we that thou wilt hear us, still imploring
Thy love and favor, kept to us always. Amen.

W. C. DOANE, 1886

THE BISHOP

THINE, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the
glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the
heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O Lord,
and thou art exalted as head above all.

I CHRONICLES 29:11.

THE CHARGE AND BLESSING

The People shall kneel.

GO forth into the world in peace; be of good courage; hold fast to that which is good; render to no man evil for evil; strengthen the faint-hearted; support the weak; help the afflicted; love all men; serve the Lord; rejoice in the power of the Spirit.

And the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be upon you and remain with you always.
Amen.

*The People will remain at their places
until the Retiring Procession
has left the Chapel.*

Bishop Nash's Sermon

ALMIGHTY GOD, OUR HEAVENLY FATHER, *who hast committed to Thy Holy Church the care and nurture of Thy children, enlighten with Thy wisdom those who teach and those who learn, that, rejoicing in the knowledge of Thy truth, they may worship Thee and serve Thee from generation to generation, through Jesus Christ our Lord.* AMEN.

“Let the man of understanding know how to handle life.”

Our text is from the sixth verse of the first chapter of Proverbs, in James Moffatt's translation.

We, who have come here for this conference, and you, who dwell here at St. Paul's School, live in a kind of community which most of you students of the school will hardly live in after you leave its walls. But we educators who have come are living still in a strange and distinct type of human community — namely, one whose prime business and fundamental purpose are to teach and learn the truth of God.

NORMAN BURDETT NASH, born in Bangor, Maine, in 1888, graduated from the Cambridge Latin School in 1905 and from Harvard College, where he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa, in 1909. After one year at the Harvard Law School, he entered the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and received the degree of B.D. there in 1915; and was ordained Deacon in 1915, Priest in 1916. He studied at Cambridge University for a year; then returned as Instructor to the Episcopal Theological School, where he was later Assistant Professor of the New Testament (1919-1927) and Professor of Christian Social Ethics (1927-1939). From 1939 to 1947 he was Rector of St. Paul's School; and from 1947 to 1956 Bishop of Massachusetts. On his retirement as Bishop of Massachusetts, a fortnight after the Symposium, he was appointed Bishop of the Convocation of Protestant Episcopal Churches in Europe. In 1918-1919, Bishop Nash was a chaplain and 1st Lieutenant with the 150th Field Artillery in France.

Schools such as these are not just associations of teachers and students living in the larger community with its great diversity of affairs and viewpoints. They are communities devoted primarily to learning. Such a place comes somewhere near being the sort of city described in the eighth chapter of this same book of Proverbs, “Doth not wisdom cry, and understanding put forth her voice? She crieth at the gates, at the entry of the city: ‘Harken unto me, O ye children. Hear instruction, and be wise, and refuse it not. For whoso findeth me, findeth life. But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul. All they that hate me love death.’”

The writer of that superb and solemn passage traditionally was that pompous, polygamous potentate, King Solomon; but you have not so learned in Sacred Studies in this school, for that traditional authorship has long ago been given up by scholars of the type who teach here. The Book of Proverbs comes from a far later period in the history of the Hebrew people. It is the work of a man who was a professional teacher and learner. He lived in a highly civilized society far beyond the reach of the little kingdom of Solomon — a society in which Hebrew and Greek culture had to some degree coalesced and where the systematic pursuit of knowledge had become a respected profession.

In his day, as even a cursory reading of his book shows, education was indeed general education. Practical know-how, science, politics, moral theory, philosophy, and religion are all included in his account of what he loves to call wisdom, meaning an understanding of man, nature, and God, a rationale of all reality, and especially knowledge to be lived by. “Let the man of understanding know how to handle life.”

We find that his book is full of awareness that the high civilization of its day and the good life to be lived therein depended on the outcome of a continuing struggle between wisdom and folly for the control of man’s affairs. To quote our poet-educator again: “By me,” cries wisdom, “by me, kings reign and princes decree justice. . . I lead in the way of righteousness, in

the midst of the paths of judgment. . . I, wisdom, dwell with prudence, and find out knowledge of witty inventions.”

So it was in his day, and so it is in ours. Men and women, young and old, the nations they constitute, and the civilizations they inherit and build, are deaf at their peril to the ancient cry of wisdom: “Whoso findeth me, findeth life: all they that hate me, love death.”

Once upon a time, before preaching a baccalaureate sermon at a college, I received a request from an anonymous member of the senior class: “Please let your sermon be brief, humorous and contain no message.” This truly pathetic and quite foolish appeal indicated, I hope, merely an examination period mood. All of us educators and educatees are familiar with that mood. Indeed, it has found expression in another book of Hebrew wisdom — in the twelfth chapter of Ecclesiastes, where in a famous gloomy utterance, the author says, “of making many books” (I presume he included examination books) “there is no end; and much study is a weariness of the flesh.”

We all of us know that mood. But if it be a permanent mood, we come to educational and intellectual bankruptcy. We cannot thus dodge our debt to the schools where we have studied, and to the colleges where we have learned, and to the places where we teach. We cannot evade the age-long struggle of our race, to learn more and to handle life better. Our schools are committed to this conflict and the diplomas which their teachers have earned certify that they have to some reasonable degree been fruitfully exposed to the sort of learning our ancient educator praised so highly. Our obligations as young men receiving education, as older men trying to transmit it, are unenforceable, but they are also undeniable.

How high indeed is our American evaluation of the worth of learning in the struggle for wisdom, as measured either by the number and quality of those who make it their life’s work to enhance and transmit it, or by the great multitude of young people who are annually certified to have reached a creditable standard therein! This American evaluation speaks for itself; and even the anguished cries — perhaps never louder than

today — of the most exasperated critics of our schools and colleges testify to our national belief in their possibilities, and to a hope that we educators by bettering our knowledge, our wisdom, and our institutions, may yet prove ourselves better educators.

There is a story of a young student, much younger than any student in St. Paul's School, who was given a book on penguins to read and report upon. The book-report began with a classic sentence: "This book tells me more about penguins than I am interested to learn." Now, I am afraid everyone's education — certainly my own — has had in it at least a penguin or two. Indeed, my diploma from the Cambridge Latin School of a little over fifty years ago might well have had an added sentence: "This diploma is also awarded in happy memory of N. B. Nash's plane geometry; may it rest in peace!" I could not any more do those theorems now than I could fly. I suppose that like things have happened in some measure to the most learned and the most eager and zealous and delighted teacher here today. But this is educational loss.

We have probably all heard that famous story of Mr. Kirtledge's father, one of the most learned men America has ever known, who, passing by the mathematics section in the Harvard Library stacks, said to his companion, "Doesn't it make one ashamed to know he cannot understand any of that!" That is a different attitude toward penguins, is it not?

But also I am sure that in our own educational experience there has been at least one subject which, at perhaps a time we can well remember, came alive, whether by the inspiration of books or more often by the zeal of a good teacher. It suddenly came into our minds this was exciting, this was something to be pursued for its own sake. There was a wonder in our minds. To provide for the cultivation of such an interest as that is one, perhaps the chief, business of schools and colleges. For once that little spark is fanned into a flame, it may be durable and lead the student far, far beyond his early notion of what he was going to do with his life.

One may leave an educational attainment unused until it

has perished. It is a fact that a diploma may be a tombstone rather than a milestone in one's educational career. On some American campuses, there is an unofficial but traditional commencement festivity, which consists of burning books. This is a very foolish recreation. One might far better celebrate one's graduation by taking account of stock and seeing which parts of one's education have come alive and are to be pursued without the necessity of assigned papers and assigned reading, and without an academic judgment day of examination. When that begins to happen, we begin to be really educated — genuine seekers of wisdom.

Continuing self-education is the mark of growing intellectual maturity, the source of real cultivation; and, for a teacher, to have that experience in his own field is indeed to be saved from the disaster that can befall a man when the very subject which he is seeking to transmit has gone dead for him. I once heard Dr. Drury say that the fate of altogether too many teachers and ministers was to become "lack-lustre routineers." The classroom of the mere routineer is not a place where the spark of interest and concern in the pupil is fanned into a living and durable flame.

Our ancient lover of wisdom, the author of the Book of Proverbs, displays several attitudes which are conducive to a life-long self-education, the real pursuit and reaching of wisdom. The first of these attitudes which his book so clearly shows is an abiding sense of wonder. There is a vivid formulation of this toward the end of his book: "There be three things which are too wonderful for me, yea, four which I understand not: the way of an eagle in the air; the way of a serpent upon a rock; the way of a ship in the midst of the sea; and the way of a man with a maid." What a superb selection of wonders and how again and again in this old book the wonder of the mind finds beautiful poetic expression! We have learned more since his day about the way of an eagle in the sky, about the way of a serpent upon a rock, about the way of a ship in the midst of the sea, and (with or without benefit of Kinsey) we have learned more about the way of a man with a maid. But

wonder abides. There is much to learn and wonder at, no matter how learned in your field you may become. God pity you if wonder is destroyed, for only with wonder endures the intellectual humility which every teacher must preserve. With wonder, he is aware of more wonders to be learned. He knows that there is a frontier of learning, beyond which is the unknown — not necessarily the unknowable, but the still to be explored, understood, and lived. This is the salvation of the real teacher.

The same wonder and delight in the world and the knowledge of it are reflected in another passage where wisdom speaks again: “The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old . . . I was daily His delight . . . rejoicing in the habitable part of His earth; and my delights were with the sons of men.” This is a lovely poetic way of stating a fundamental religious conviction: that God is not only the source of wonder, but that He himself delights in His work — that there is a joy in the creation which the created child of God may share, and that this is a divine reality.

The belief in the intelligibility of the world, the zest for learning, the abiding joy in the wonder and mystery of life has many enemies. It can be destroyed by sophistication, which is the premature hardening of the intellectual arteries and a very common academic disease. It may be ruined by being simply atrophied, by losing the habits of learning. When the routineer does not need to learn more, he has his class sufficiently at a disadvantage so that he need not worry! But any graduate of a good school or college and any teacher in the same can escape such spiritual diseases as this. He can stake out a field of learning which he proposes to, and does, cultivate for himself. He can enjoy the pleasure of study which is not prescribed, the joy of writing — not against an academic deadline — the freedom from the terror of the academic day of judgment. And so he will preserve and enhance his capacity to wonder, to enjoy, to learn with delight, and to be free from the Philistinism that is indeed the principle of death in the mind and in the imagination. Here is the educator’s opportunity and

task, the wonder and the delight of his profession: to keep that light burning within himself and to help the younger learner to fan it into a durable flame.

So much for wonder. A second attitude conducive to a continuing and happy education is our wise man's awareness that, since learning is for living and so much of living is fellowship with others, one needs to be continually studying the ways of men and women in the interrelations of society. One must always be learning more about the art of living with others constructively and intelligently — if possible, harmoniously — for their enduring welfare and one's own.

Now, this study of man may be cheapened — and it often is in our day — to aim no higher than at learning “how to make friends and influence people,” how to manipulate them for one's own power and glory. By such perversity, an uneducated Austrian psychopathic genius named Hitler undertook to found a durable world of dominion by an élite in his own likeness. His folly did tragically much to destroy our civilization. Better educated and less pathological egotists are found, alas, on the faculties and in the administrations of many schools and colleges. They cannot work as much harm by their more moderate dreams of grandeur, but they do fail in self-understanding and in their human relations. They are the real problem children of the school and the college. For problem teachers and problem administrators are much more serious problems than problem pupils. They master too little the wisdom of the good life in fellowship, which can be learned and enjoyed in such communities as the school in which we gather and the schools from which we come — communities which aid all their members toward life-long study and practice of the art of handling life.

Now each of us, being human, has his share of the folly which refuses to learn this art. We have yet an enormous deal, every one of us, to learn of that wisdom in human relations which makes the wise man or woman, the good neighbor, the good teacher, the good school community. And there is a word for every one of us in Proverbs: “If thou hast done

foolishly in lifting up thyself...lay thine hand upon thy mouth.” To ask a teacher to be silent is asking a lot, but it is necessary.

The modesty that listens more than it speaks; the courtesy that does not demand consideration, but expresses it and grants it; the reverence for others that does not seek the center of every stage, even the stage of one’s own classroom; the graciousness that gives but does not grasp; the sensitive imagination that appreciates the other person’s viewpoint and feelings: these grow by taking thought and by practice. They are strength, not weakness. They are wisdom, and not folly. They are certainly not the wisdom of the world, but the wisdom which the world desperately needs to learn, lest its folly destroy us all. If we teachers would not play the fool, here indeed must we continue in our education.

Down at the Hill School, they tell a delightful story of a Sacred Studies class: a master was trying, without much success, to interpret a parable and the dumbest boy in the class was the most vocal. He kept insisting that he did not yet see what it was all about — in which he was quite correct. The teacher finally lost patience, and said, “What’s the matter with you? The simple peasants of Galilee understood that parable”; and the boy said, “Yes, sir, but they had a pretty good teacher.”

A particularly difficult adjustment awaits the young egotist who will go soon from the good will of his school community to study and work and live in the more complex and less benevolent community outside. For that community will not be so kindly disposed toward his youthful folly. The world gives very little priority to young egotism and can deal very harshly with the young egotist. How are we preparing him before he hits that kind of a community, for life in every community? I think this task begins in every one of us teachers. We shall do well to pray, “Lord, when I have done foolishly in lifting up myself, lay Thou Thine hand upon my mouth.”

A third attitude of our ancient wise man, also highly conducive to self-education and wisdom, is his attributing wisdom to God as its source, with the accompanying awareness that

one is responsible to God for the right use of His gift. Our poet is not so much a philosopher of education, as a man of religious trust. He believes that the world has meaning, because a being of everlasting truth, the living God, sustains it.

We have just heard that magnificent passage from Job which, after describing the glory of wisdom, winds up in a simple and very profound sentence: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom and to depart from evil is understanding."

A like verse in Proverbs runs, in a contemporary translation: "The first thing in knowledge is reverence for the Eternal; to know the Holy One is understanding."

Now this religious faith, as we all know, was, in the earlier days of American education, either assumed or explicitly declared almost everywhere. Today, to put it mildly, there is far from universal or even customary acceptance of it. If it were possible or worthwhile for us to assess blame for what has happened (a favorite recreation of Christian educators today), we might in part scold the secularists and in part blame our predecessors, the too conservative Christian educators of an earlier day, who were so respectful of traditional orthodoxy that they could not recognize new truth from God. But I am concerned right now only to maintain that the trust in the God of truth is both a firm foundation and an unfailing energy for life-long learning. Excluding the cockiness of the know-it-all, the cleverness of the sophisticate, and the exhibitionism of the consciously and snobbishly learned, rebuking the intellectual torpor of those who no longer seek to learn, this religious awareness heightens the wonder and delight in life, the zest and passion for knowledge, which take the drudgery and dullness out of one's continued education and out of one's professional teaching.

And, finally, my fellow-citizens of the community of learning, this union of faith and understanding will keep us all humble in our knowledge without becoming depressed or frustrated by our ignorance. It will keep us grateful for what God has granted us to learn, and to those, His agents, who

have helped us learn. It will keep us thankful to the community of learning, and expectant of new and ever-increasing wisdom from the only wise God. May the education, even of the oldest of us, have only begun; and may He continue to teach us all, young and old, to learn and love wisdom all our days. "Let the man of understanding know how to handle life." May our house of wisdom be built on a rock of trust in the Lord of all good learning, the everlasting God of ever-living truth.

At the conclusion of the luncheon in the New Upper Dining Room, which immediately followed the Chapel Service just recorded, the Rector began the proceedings by presenting a St. Paul's School Bowl to Dr. Tillich, whose address the preceding morning had opened the Symposium. Mr. Warren then also presented Bowls to Professor Johnson, who had acted as moderator of the discussion the evening before, and to George Reath, Jr., and Robert A. G. Monks, speakers at that discussion. To Rowland Stebbins, 3d — also a speaker at the evening symposium — and to Bishop Nash, preacher at the Chapel Service, the Rector presented copies of the Centennial Edition of the Chapel Services book, for both of them had received St. Paul's School Bowls at the One Hundredth Anniversary celebration last June.

The speaker at the luncheon was to be Mr. Robert Birley, Head Master of Eton College, who had been at St. Paul's as a member of the faculty since the opening of the school year. Mr. Warren introduced him as follows:

“If there is anything calculated to scare the wits out of you as the headmaster of a school, it could be the visit of the Head Master of Eton, to become a colleague and fellow worker. I will confess that such fright had crossed my mind from time to time, and even threatened to shiver my timbers, prior to Mr. Birley's arrival.

“I can honestly say I have never enjoyed anything more than I have the visit of Eton's distinguished Head Master. A graduate of Rugby and Balliol, master at Eton, Headmaster of Charterhouse, Advisor to the British Army of Occupation in Germany from 1947 to 1949, and Head Master of Eton College — St. Paul's School is honored to have address us on this occasion our friend and colleague, Dr. Robert Birley.”

Dr. Birley's Address

I HOPE you will forgive me if I start by speaking personally. I really cannot begin without saying first what a privilege I feel it is to have been asked to speak at the One Hundredth Anniversary Symposium of S. Paul's School. I shall not attempt to deny that I am very proud that you at S. Paul's should have thought to invite me to come here from over 4,000 miles away for this great occasion. I come here from another school which is a Church School in the sense that S. Paul's is, but in some ways its problems are very different. Let me take one example. In this country, religious instruction is not given in any school which is in the public system of education — it is, in fact, illegal to give it — and so the teaching of Sacred Studies in itself sets a school like S. Paul's apart from all the schools in that public system. In England, not only is Christian instruction given in every school in the public system of education, but it is illegal not to give it. Furthermore, in about half the schools in England that instruction is given according to the tenets of some religious denomination. At Eton, religious instruction, under the Statutes of the School, must be according to the doctrines of the Church of England, but exactly the

ROBERT BIRLEY was Brackenbury Scholar at Balliol College, Oxford, won the Gladstone Memorial Prize in 1924, and received his degree of M.A. with First Class Honors in History. He published a book on *The English Jacobins* in 1925, and a volume of *Speeches and Documents in American History* (selected and edited by him) in 1944. In 1948, he gave the Burge Memorial Lecture; and the Reith Lectures in 1949. He was a member (in 1944) of the Fleming Committee on Public Schools. He is a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries; and a Companion of St. Michael and St. George. The University of Leeds and the University of Edinburgh have each conferred upon him the honorary degree of Doctor of Civil Law.

same is true, for instance, of the little elementary school further down the High Street of the village of Eton — and that is a school where the teachers are paid from the taxes and which is administered by a public body under regulations laid down in the Education Act of 1944.

May I add that S. Paul's School made arrangements, not only that I should attend this Symposium, but that I should have the opportunity to learn something about the educational problems of America. They did this not only by making it possible for me to visit schools and colleges and to talk with those working in them, but also by making me for some weeks a member of their faculty. The combined experience has not only had the effect of making me realize the absurdity of some of my preconceived ideas about American education; it has also enabled me to understand to some degree how your problems differ from ours in England, and also, which I have found so interesting, how often they are the same.

I speak to you as one who has spent thirty-three of his fifty-three years in Church Schools, five as a boy at Rugby, ten as an assistant master at Eton, eleven as Head Master of Charterhouse and seven as Head Master of Eton. Between Charterhouse and Eton, from 1947 to 1949, I worked in Germany, dealing with the rebuilding of Education in that country after the war. I mention this because I am aware that my experiences when I was not a schoolmaster have colored my views on the problems which we have been discussing during these two days.

What does it really mean to me when I say that I belong to a Church School, or, to take my line from the title of this Symposium, what does it mean to me to belong to a Church School *now*, in this particular moment of World History? I am going to begin with the Chapel and its services. George Reath told us last night that the Chapel was the first of the buildings of S. Paul's. Perhaps that is why I feel so at home here. King Henry VI founded Eton as a Church, which he hoped would be a great centre of pilgrimages, to be served by a College of Priests, and with a school attached to it. Noth-

ing could have seemed to him more natural. Only about thirty years before, Chief Justice Thirwall had stated in the famous Gloucester Grammar School case, using the legal Norman-French of his day, that "Education des enfans est chose espiritual." "The education of children is a religious matter." But what can the Chapel and its services mean *now*, in a society which, unlike that of King Henry VI and the Chief Justice, is essentially a secular one? At Eton, has the Church a school attached to it still, or is there a School, which has a chapel attached, like a gymnasium or a library? Or has something been evolved during the centuries which can be expressed in neither way?

My mind goes back to an incident in my life as a schoolmaster which taught me more than anything else has done about this. It was shortly before the second World War and I was then Head Master of Charterhouse. I should explain that at Charterhouse the Head Master is also a housemaster in charge of a house of sixty-five boys, that is, a house in which they stay during their whole five years at the school, so that towards those boys the Head Master has a rather strange dual relationship. One day it was reported to me, as Head Master, that a boy in my own house had absented himself from the daily service in Chapel for several days running. I asked him to see me and he told me that he had become a Communist and that he had decided on conscientious grounds that he could not continue to attend Christian services. I pointed out to him that this was obviously a serious matter, as the rules of the school laid it down that every boy should attend them. Just because it was so serious and because it would, therefore, be necessary for us to go into the whole matter very thoroughly, I said that I should give him leave not to go to Chapel for a month, which would give us some time to talk it over. During that month, I can remember discussing the question with him for hours and hours, and I seemed to be getting nowhere. But, just as, if you set a monkey down at a type-writer and give him all eternity in which to type, he is bound in the end to type the whole Bible, so, I can see, in the end I was bound to

make the one remark I ought to have made at the beginning. One day I said to him, "Look here, supposing you and I were in Moscow on May the first, do you think Stalin would have the right to force us to attend the May Day Parade in the Red Square?" "Certainly," he replied. I asked him why. "Well, the Communists believe that in Communism lies the salvation of the world; the May Day Parade is an expression of that belief, so, if we were there, of course he would have the right to insist on our attending it." "Well," I said, "I am afraid that it is exactly the same here. We believe at Charterhouse that in Christianity lies the salvation of the world, and our Chapel Services are an expression of that belief." "Now that," he exclaimed, "now *that* I can understand. I can accept that. I am ready to go to Chapel." After hearing Dr. Tillich's paper, I can understand better why it was that he agreed with me. Although, of course, he did not know it, he believed in — or perhaps, rather, he *wanted* — an education of induction.

And, of course — or so it seems to me — he was absolutely right. For, in fact, I had given him the only valid reason for the institution of compulsory daily Christian services. Without that, one is forced back on the theory that they exist to make boys better. Any boy knows what nonsense that is. He goes to Chapel, he hears the Bible read, he joins in the prayers — it will be very seldom that he will then go out feeling that he is a better boy. The Chapel Service must be an expression of the belief on which the school rests.

I am sure that you will realise, however, the tremendous duty which this places on a Church School. To begin with, it does not make the actual conduct of the services any easier, but rather far more difficult. It is much harder for a Chapel Service to represent adequately a profound belief than it is for it to be the means of conveying a moral lesson. Boys who have left Eton have sometimes told me that what in recollection meant most to them in the services were the periods of silence. When they say this, I feel that they had probably come to appreciate them as they should. It was not for nothing that the Psalmist said, "Be still then, and know that I am

God.” But the silences must be entirely natural; if the boys once feel that they are deliberately arranged, except, perhaps, very occasionally, they will assuredly become self-conscious. The silences must depend very largely on the most delicate intuition of the Chapel Organist. (And may I say here, as a practising Head Master, how much those of us in Church Schools owe to our organists.)

But the real problem remains. The perfect Chapel Service would not have any meaning as the expression of a belief if there was no belief to express. What does one actually mean by saying that a school rests on a belief in the Christian religion?

Long experience has taught me that treatises on education are almost all unreadable, but one of them is not, Milton’s *Tractate on Education*. It may be worth while looking at this to see if the greatest of English religious poets will give us any help. In one of the most splendid sentences in English prose he says, “I call therefore a complete and generous education that which fits a man to perform justly, skilfully and magnanimously all the offices both private and public, of peace and war.” An American literary critic has pointed out, however, that, while this definition is very well known, another in the same book, perhaps as fine, is not. This runs, “The end then of learning is to repair the ruins of our first parents by regaining to know God aright, and out of that knowledge to love him, to imitate him, to be like him, as we may the nearest by possessing our souls of true virtue, which being united to the heavenly grace of faith makes up the highest perfection.” But when we come to read the book there seems to be strangely little about religious education and Milton’s ideal Academy seems very unlike a Church School. Milton did what very few writers on educational theory ever do, he actually constructed a curriculum. And what a curriculum! One reads through a quite terrifying list of authors and subjects. “The next step,” I am quoting at random, “would be the authors on agriculture, Cato, Varro and Columella, for the matter is most easy, and, if the language be difficult, so much the better; it is not a difficulty beyond their years.” I read on further down, “And

having thus passed the principles of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and geography with a general compact of physics, they may descend in mathematics to the instrumental science of trigonometry and from thence to fortification, architecture, engineering and navigation. And in natural philosophy they may proceed leisurely from the history of meteors, minerals, plants and living creatures as far as anatomy.” Again I cast my eye further on, “They may then begin the study of economics. And, either now or before this, they may easily have learned at any odd hour the Italian tongue.” There is singularly little in it all about religious instruction. It is true that his students were to read “the determinate sentences of David or Solomon, or the gospels and apostolic scriptures,” but this was only to be “in their nightward studies wherewith they close the day’s work,” and, when at last they were allowed to study some theology, it was to be only on Sundays and in the evenings. At last we come to the culmination of all this vast programme, the study of literary criticism, which, he says, “would make them soon perceive what despicable creatures our common rhymers and playwrights be” — and then, suddenly, we see what it was all meant to lead up to, “and show them what religious, what glorious and magnificent use might be made of poetry, both in divine and human things.” And one realises that “the true end” for Milton of the whole laborious process was that these various studies should be put to a glorious and magnificent purpose, which was a religious purpose too.

Now, suppose you had intervened coldly while Milton was describing his ideal to you and had put him the question, “What exactly is a Christian trigonometry?” Or suppose, which is more to the point, we asked it of ourselves. Perhaps it would make it easier to answer if we altered the question. What would a Communist say if we asked him, “What exactly is a Marxist trigonometry?” I think we know quite well how he would reply. He would say it was trigonometry taught by a man who deeply and sincerely believed in the Marxist doctrine and who was educating children in the hope and trust that they would grow up to further that belief. And that,

mutatis mutandis, is what a Christian education should amount to.

But education is not only a matter of intellectual instruction. What will it mean to give moral instruction in a truly Christian school? I think that if we answered the question honestly we should find it would often make things pretty difficult for us. Let us suppose, for instance, that a boy comes before a master on a charge of dishonesty. How easy it is to take the line that he must realize that such conduct will prevent people from trusting him and that he will never get on in the world if that happens. He will understand that argument. But — and I say this in all reverence — it is not the kind of thing that will be said to him at the Day of Judgment.

A Church School, in fact, is not, or ought not to be, at all an easy kind of school. And there are even greater difficulties than any we have yet considered. For a Christian must always be haunted by certain statements which simply cannot be fitted into any normal secular way of thinking. “The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.” “And though I have . . . all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.” “But by the grace of God I am what I am; and His grace which was bestowed on me was not in vain.” I sometimes think that the one book which every master in a Church School ought to read is *The Confessions of S. Augustine*. Try to imagine what it would be like to have the young Augustine in one’s school. S. Augustine, as a writer, is always disturbing and he carries on his immortal task of disturbance very efficiently when he is read by a schoolmaster. Think how the boy who took part in that disgraceful episode of the stealing of the pears, a member of a gang of young, well-to-do rowdies, moved by nothing but the love of an escapade, was to write the tremendous last paragraph of his book in which he spoke of how in former times he had done evil and in later times some good, but “Thou, the One, the good God, didst never cease doing good”; how no man can teach this secret of the

divine grace to man, no Angel can teach it to man or to other Angel, "let it be asked of Thee, sought in Thee, knocked for at Thee, so, so shall it be received, so shall it be found, so shall it be opened." A Church School must be one where the masters are not satisfied merely with producing the straight, honourable, responsible young men which any school will want to turn out. In the Church School there must be also a determination to try somehow to recognize in what one might call the most unpromising material the seeds which the grace of God may cause to grow into the adventurer or the pioneer; there must be the ability to distinguish among the young rebels between the one who may become the fighter, having in his breast the readiness to respond to a fine cause when it is presented to him, and the one who will go through life a mere quarreller.

We heard last night a call for the Church School to produce leaders, and it is from the fighters, awkward, difficult and tiresome as they often are, that such leaders will come. And it is when we consider them that we realise that a Church School *in vacuo* means nothing. We have to consider not only the Church School, but the Church School in our time.

For myself, any understanding that I have of the demands which are now made on the Church Schools came not from my life inside them, so largely sheltered from the world outside, but from my life in Germany and Central Europe after the war. Let me try to express this through a personal experience. It was in the autumn of 1946 and I was in Czechoslovakia. Like any other person brought up in a school such as Rugby or S. Paul's, I was familiar enough with the great symbols of the Book of Revelations, the four living creatures, the scarlet woman, the beast with seven heads and ten horns — and, though they might be poetically satisfying, how absurd they seemed to me. And then one day I visited the Castle of the Spielberg, which stands above the town of Brno in Moravia. It had been the headquarters of the Gestapo during the Nazi occupation of the country, a place of almost unimaginable cruelty and wickedness. I found that the Chapel of the

Castle had been left unaltered since those dreadful days. It had been turned by the Nazis into a Chapel of their new pagan religion. Where the altar had stood was now a great block of stone, on which, lit by strong electric lights, lay the new Bible, Hitler's book, *Mein Kampf*. Torches blazed from the walls. And behind the altar, where before had hung a picture of the crucified Christ, was fixed an immense grey stone eagle, its grasping talons stretching downwards. At once the tremendous symbols of the Apocalypse of S. John came to life for me; they have never been unreal or absurd to me since then.

I know that the young men from this school and from mine will not have to go out into societies where Evil stands supreme as it has done and still does in many parts of Europe. But I am convinced that what I saw in Germany and Central Europe was not merely some aberration of human nature, which we can ignore as irrelevant to ourselves, or which we shall only have to resist as some aggression from outside. For, what happened under the Nazis, and is happening now under the Communists, shows us something of the dangers which face our own society, even though we may reasonably believe that our national traditions would save us from the most fantastic manifestations of Evil, if the worst came to the worst. And let me make it quite clear that, when I speak of the worst coming to the worst, I do not mean defeat in a war; I mean the breakdown of our civilization from within, from its own inner weaknesses.

We live — and how hard it is to realize this, either among the wooded hills of New Hampshire or by the quiet waters of the Thames — in an age of profound revolution. Just how profound it is I came to realise when for over two years I had to deal with the Russians in Germany on educational questions. In any civilization it is possible to recognise certain works as the fundamental classics of its culture. In our own civilization the two great pillars supporting its secular literature are Homer and Virgil. It does not matter that comparatively few have read them for the last fifteen hundred years. We are what we are, we certainly write as we write, because

of them. Now, in the Communist culture, they have simply disappeared. But no culture can exist without its classics and the classics of our civilization have been replaced. The classics of Communist culture — and this may surprise you as much as it surprised me — are Shakespeare and Dickens. I think it was when I came to realise this that I understood that Communism is a genuine new culture, not just a transient social movement. Now, if we are to preserve our civilization, we must preserve its classics; without them the building cannot stand. It is no use removing the foundations of a building and then thinking that it will stand all right because it is a comfortable house to live in. But is not this precisely what we are doing?

For the Church School, however, Homer and Virgil are not enough. For there is another classic, greater than these, on which our civilization rests, one which naturally has quite disappeared in Communist society, and that, of course, is the Bible. I feel that our first duty in the field of Sacred Studies is simply to familiarise the boys at our schools with the Bible. For, unless this is done, Christian civilization is certainly doomed. That is where there is a positive danger in so many of the excellent books on Christian Ethics or Christian Doctrine used in our schools. They have their part to play, but they can never take the place of the Bible itself.

This Symposium has, I think, put before us remarkably clearly some of the tasks which face the Church School. And I am very glad that yesterday we were made to consider the life of a boy after he leaves one of them. The danger, as Dr. Tillich pointed out, is not so much that he will come face to face with an opposing culture; it is that he will be confronted by no culture at all. Very few young men in your country or in mine or in Western Germany, where I worked, are Communists. But very many of them, though they do not realise it, believe in what one might call Marxism without its apocalyptic element. For they believe that the world is ultimately governed by economic forces and economic forces only. The terrible danger of this attitude is that it leads one to accept Power as inevitable when it comes, in whatever form it takes.

One has to, because it is the inevitable outcome of economic processes, over which one has no control. Any form of sociology which is divorced from ethics — and the boy who goes to college is sure to come up against such — is, I feel, a manifestation of this attitude of mind.

The danger is that such an attitude will not seem to produce a challenge at all. Dr. Tillich pointed out that our present-day materialist society really needs no induction. As I have said, a society with such a climate of opinion cannot be said to have a culture at all. Someone said to me in Germany in 1935, “granted the Nazis are devils. But remember that they came into a house with empty rooms.” The technical achievements of our society hide from us the fact that the rooms are empty.

What is the duty of a Church School in this state of affairs? I am absolutely certain that it is its duty to prepare its boys to meet it. It can be done in two ways. First, through the normal intercourse out of the classroom between masters and boys, when there should be many opportunities. The secret here, I believe, is not to be always pushing the conversation into channels where discussions on such questions can be held, but to see to it that enough of one’s normal conversation with boys is on the kind of topics, politics, art, literature and so on, which raise these questions from their very nature. And the second way is in the classroom. Frankly, I consider this to be the more important.

I do not for one moment believe that this should mean the institution of a special branch of study. The need can be met, for instance, by the study of great books. If you want an example, I could not give you a better one than the course which I found myself allotted to take with a Sixth Form class here this term. I only wish I could stay to finish it. It consists of two books, Machiavelli’s *The Prince* and Sir Thomas More’s *Utopia*. Now, I defy anyone to teach these two books without a consideration of exactly the kind of question which ought to be considered at a Church School, questions such as what part should be played by morality in politics, whether international relations are possible without a condition of trust

between states, or how far the State should intervene in an attempt to better social conditions.

Perhaps I should make it clear that this does not mean that I think that boys need not study ordinary history. As those who have been in my class are well aware, I do not believe that one can profitably study Machiavelli without a knowledge of the Italian history of his day. And in some ways the study of historical biography seems to me to be the best preparation of all for the world before them. Considering the actions of people, whether they were wise or foolish, good or bad, teaches one even more than considering their ideas.

In a group discussion which I attended yesterday, it was suggested that such treatment in a Church School could never be convincing because the boys would know before the discussion started which side was going to win. I do not think that the criticism is valid, though it is a very good thing for a master to realise that the boys may feel this. We might consider the example set us by the greatest of all schoolmasters — if I may stretch the term — Socrates. He knew quite well that no solutions would carry conviction unless the problems had been honestly considered, but he was not afraid of having his own ideas about them.

Suppose, now, we imagine an ideal school which provides those who go out from it the armour and weapons that will be of use to them in the society in which they will live their lives. They have received, to use Dr. Tillich's phrase, an induction. But induction into what? As a school is only a place to prepare for life, it is not enough if it only inducts its boys into itself. What are they going to do when they leave it? What I say now I say with great diffidence. If I speak with a presumption which you feel that no visitor should show, I hope you will lay the blame on the faculty of this school, S. Paul's, who have spoiled me so thoroughly that I have been positively encouraged to be presumptuous. But when I compare the schools like the one I come from in England with the Church Schools of this country, one fact strikes me as a real difference. In these schools in England, one can be sure that a considerable num-

ber of the boys will in due course play a part in political life, local or national. This does not seem to me nearly as usual in the Church Schools here. I am not unaware of the difficulties, the size and diversity of this country, and — here I know I am in danger of presumption — most important of all perhaps, the nature of American political life. Entry into political life in America is not an inviting prospect for the boy from a Church School. Here we have a vicious circle: political life needs good men to make it a worth-while career, but good men will not go into it because of the kind of life it is. A vicious circle can only be broken by the violent action of individuals. I believe that it is the duty of the Church Schools in America to send out more boys who will storm this citadel. Another field — and here I can lay no great claims for the Church Schools of my own country — is the field of education itself, the public high schools. I know that when one thinks of the immense number of public schools in this vast country it may seem almost absurd to suggest that the Church Schools can do anything worth doing with the very small number of men that they could hope to send to work in this field. They might encourage themselves, however, with these unreported words of David, as he approached Goliath, “This target, at least, is almost impossible to miss.” And we should never forget the very great influence which one single individual can have in a school, and that his influence is an ever-widening one, as his pupils go out into the world.

In conclusion, I should like to say how grateful I feel to those here who have arranged this Symposium. It has given me — and I think it has given to us all — two things of the utmost value, a realisation of difficulties and a sense of urgency. And I should like to refer especially to the three papers we heard last night. Just because they came from the other side, as it were, they gave to someone who became the Head Master of a Church School before two of them were born an insight into the nature of the problem such as he has not been given for a very long time.

The Rector warmly thanked Mr. Birley, and presented him with some books—several substantial volumes — “to read on his journey back to England”; and then with a few brief concluding remarks brought to a close the academic celebration of the School’s One Hundredth Year.

SPEAKERS AT THE SYMPOSIUM



The Rector, Dr. Tillich, Bishop Nash, Dr. Birley



G. Reath, Jr., R. Stebbins 3d, R. A. G. Monks, Prof. Johnson, the Rector



Registration of Guests



In Memorial Hall, Dr. Tillich speaking



Dr. Tillich

FOUR OF TH



EIGHT SEMINARS





The Panel



After the Symposium

Theology of Education

Mr. Headmaster, Students, ladies and gentlemen,
In the letter ^{one of} ~~which~~ ^{from the} ~~invitation~~ I received of your
Headmaster he wrote: "There is a great deal of talk about
philosophy of education ~~and~~ but very little talk about theolo-
gy of education." This sentence encouraged me ~~to give this~~ ^{or because}
~~a speaker~~ ^{when I started to think about my speech}
talk for the 100th anniversary of St. Louis school this fa-
mous school. For I would not have been able ~~for~~ to
speak ~~to~~ ^{about} something like ~~philosophy~~ a methodology of edu-
cation, not being an expert at all in this field. ~~But~~
The only justification for my standing here ^{in this moment} is that some-
time ago I thought about the relation of religion
and culture ~~generally~~. I also considered the problem

First page of Dr. Tillich's manuscript, from which he delivered his address

THE CHAPEL



SERVICE





Dr. Birley speaking in the New Upper Dining Room

After hearing S^r Gillich's paper I can understand better why it was that he agreed with me. Although, of course, he did not know it, he believed in - or, perhaps, rather, he wanted - an education of induction.

if you set a monkey down at a type-writer and give him all eternity in which to type, he is bound in the end to ^{type} the whole Bible, so, I can see, in the end I was bound to make the one remark I ought to have made at the beginning. One day I said to him, "look here, supposing you and I were in Moscow on May the first, do you think Stalin would have the right to force us to attend the May Day Parade in the Red Square?" "Certainly", he replied. I asked ^{him} why. "Well, the Communists ^{believe} ~~feel~~ that in Communism lies the salvation of the world; the May Day Parade is an expression of that belief, so, if we were there, of course he would have the right to insist on our attending it." "Well", I said, "I am afraid that ~~that~~ it is exactly the same here". We believe at Charterhouse that ⁱⁿ Christianity lies the salvation of the world and our Chapel Services are an expression of that belief." ~~Now~~ ^{Now} ~~that~~ ^{that}; he exclaimed, "now that I can understand. I can accept that. I am ready to go to Chapel."

And, of course, - or so it seems to me - he was absolutely right. For, in fact, I had given him the only valid reason for the institution of a compulsory daily Christian services. Without that one is forced back on the theory that they exist to make boys better. Any boy knows what nonsense that is. He goes to Chapel, he hears the Bible read, he joins in the prayers - it will be very seldom that he then ^{will} ~~can~~ then go out feeling that he is a better boy.

A page of the manuscript from which Dr. Birley delivered his address



Luncheon at the New Upper



Dr. Warren and Dr. Birley



FT

12/7/2012

2791745 19

00

HF GROUP - IN



